

1463
THE

En

Consecration and Succession
OF

Protestant Bishops

JUSTIFIED;

AND

The Bishop of *Durham* Vindicated.

Wherein that Infamous FABLE

OF THE

ORDINATION at the *Nag's-head* in
Cheapside, is Clearly Confuted.

By JOHN BRAMHALL, D. D.

Lord Bishop of *Derry*.

*Neceſſe eſt ut lancem in libra ponderibus impoſitis
Deprimi, ſic animum perſpicuis cedere.*

LONDON:

Printed for W. B. and Sold by THOMAS BICKERTON,
Bookseller in *Little-Britain*. 1716.





CHAP. I.

The Occasion of this Treatise.

THE fairest Ears of Corn are soonest blasted, so the more conspicuous the *Church of England* was among the Reformed Churches, (as not being framed according to the brainsick Dictates of some seditious Orator, or the giddy Humours of a tumultuous Multitude, but with mature Deliberation, and the free Consent and Concurrence of all the Orders of the Kingdom,) the more it was subjected to the Envy and groundless Calumnies of our Countrymen of the *Roman* Communion: But of all the slanderous Aspersions cast upon our Church, that lying Fable of the *Naggs-Head Ordination* doth bear the Bell away. Those monstrous Fictions of the *Cretan Bulls* and *Minotaures*, (devised by the *Athenians* to revenge themselves upon *Minos* King of *Crete*, who had subdued them in a just War, and compelled them to send their Sons to him for Hostages,) were not more malicious, nor that shameless Lie of *Kentish long Tails* more ridiculous. The first Deviser of it doth justly deserve the Character of a *Man of a Brazen Forehead and Lead-
den Heart*. If the impartial Reader, after he has perused this Treatise, think I do him wrong, I do willingly submit my self to his Censure. This prodigious Fable received its Death's wound from Mr. *Mason's* Pen, and hath remained ever since, for the Space of thirty Years, buried in deep Oblivion. And those Essays

A

which

which it makes now to get Wing again, by the Assistance of two *Ignatian* Fathers, are but the vain Attempts of a dying Cause. Neither would I have troubled the Reader or my self to bring *Owls to Athens*, or to confute a Cause which hath been so demonstratively confuted to my Hand, but for two new Additions lately spread abroad. The one by Oral Tradition which concerns my self. That *Father Talbot and Father B——* had so confuted the Bishop of Derry in the Presence of the King, that he said, he perceived his Father had made me a Lord, but not a Bishop. And that afterwards, by my Power I had procured those two Jesuits to be prohibited that Presence. So that whereas *Father Talbot* used to be the Interpreter in the Spanish Treaties, now he was not admitted, and *Don John* would admit no other.

So the Bishop of Derry is accused not only to have been publickly baffled, but also to have been a Disturber of publick Affairs. Yet I know nothing of all this, which concerns my self. I never heard of any such Conference, or any such Words, I never knew that *Father Talbot* was designed to that Employment. I was never guilty of having any such Power, much less of any Endeavour to turn out any Man. If the Fathers seemed too pragmatistical to those by whom who were intrusted, or to involve the Interest of their Religion into Civil Treaties, what is that to me? If it were true, they may thank themselves. If it were false, they may thank them who did it. Whether true or false, I never had an Hand, nor so much as a little Finger in it.

All the Truth that I know is this. Hearing that these two Fathers, had spoken largely in the Court of the Succession of our English Bishops, but never in my presence, I sought out *Father B——*, and had private Conference with him about it in the Jesuits College at *Bruges*, and afterwards some Discourse with *Father Talbot* and him together in mine own Chamber. Whatsoever they did say, they put into Writing, to which I returned them an Answer, shewing not only that there was not, but that it was morally impossible there should be any such

Ordi.

Ordination at the *Naggs-Head*. From that Day to this I never heard any thing of it, that concerned my self. Now if a Man should search for an Author of this fabulous Relation, he shall be sure to have it fathered upon some very credible Persons, without Names, who had it from *John an Okes*, whilest he was living, and he had it from *John a Stiles*, and he had it from No body, but feigned it himself out of a good Intention, according to that Case Theology, which he had learned of *Machiavel*, To advance the Credit of Religion by all Means possible, true or false.

The other Addition concerneth the Learned and Reverend Bishop of *Duresme*, one of the ancientest Bishops this Day living in the Christian World, being 95 Years old at least. That he owned and justified the *Naggs-Head Ordination* in publick Parliament, in the House of Peers. It is very well, we cannot desire a better Place where to have it spoken, than the House of Parliament; Nor better Witnesses, than the Lords Spiritual and Temporal. We have no Man of the Episcopal Order, whose Memory can reach so near those Times, or in whose Integrity we do more confide, than the Bishop of *Duresme*. He might hear many things, either from the Persons pretended to have been then consecrated, or from the Notaries or Witnesses who were then present at that imaginary Consecration. Or at least, he might receive the Tradition of that Age from such as were Eye-witnesses of what passed. Let it be put to his Testimony if they think fit, (without Doubt, he is the same Man he was then) or to the Testimony of any other of his Age and Reputation, whom they can produce. We refuse no sort of Proof, but only vain *Hear-say*, which, as our English Proverb saith, is commonly, and in this Case most undoubtedly, a *Liar*. Nay, we would not refuse the Testimony of Mr. *Neale* himself, though a professed Enemy, who was the only Founder of this silly Fable, so he might be examined upon Oath, before equal Judges, but compel him either to shame the Devil, and eat his own Words, or to run himself into such palpable *Absurdities*, *Contradictions* and *Impossibilities*,

that no Man of Reason, how partial soever, could give any Credit to him. My first Task shall be, before I meddle with the *Fable* it self, to vindicate the Bishop of *Duresme*, and the Truth, which is wounded through his Sides, with this Intimation to the Reader, that if this Branch of the *Legend* be proved apparently to be false, which is pretended to have been publickly acted in a full House of the *Peers* of the Realm, we can expect no Truth from the voluntary Report of one single Man, a malicious Enemy to his own Party; And withal a confessed Spie, of what was done at the *Naggs-Head*. *Break Ice in one place, and it will crack in more.*

CHAP. II.

The Vindication of the Bishop of Duresme.

TO vindicate the Bishop of *Duresme*, I shall first set down the Relation of this Passage, in the Words of the Fathers themselves.

In the Beginning of the late Parliament, some Presbyterian Lords presented to the Upper House Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith and Heresy, C. 2. p. 9. *a certain Book, proving that the Protestant Bishops had no Succession or Consecration, and therefore were no Bishops, and by consequence had no Right to sit in Parliament. Hereupon Doctor Morton, pretended Bishop of Durham, who is yet alive, made a Speech against this Book, in his own and all the Bishops behalf then present. He endeavoured to prove Succession from the last Catholick Bishops; who (said he) by Imposition of Hands ordained the first Protestant Bishops at the Naggs-Head in Cheap-side, as was Notorious to all the World. Therefore, the aforesaid Book ought to be look'd upon as a groundless Libel. This was told to many by one of the ancientest Peers of England, present in Parliament when Morton made his Speech. And the same he is ready to depose upon his Oath. Nay, he cannot believe that any will be so impudent as to deny a thing so notorious, whereof there are as many Witnesses living, as there are Lords and Bishops who were that Day in the Upper House of Parliament.* Here

Here are three Passages. One concerning a Book presented to the Upper House, against the Succession of *English Bishops*, by some Presbyterian Lords. The second concerning the pretended Refutation of this Book by the Bishop of *Duresme*. The third, the Proof of both these Allegations by the Testimony of an Ancient Peer of *England*.

First for the Book, It is most true, there was a Book written about that Time by a single Lord against *Episcopacy*, and dedicated to the Members of both Houses of Parliament. No wonder. How often have the Parliaments in the Reigns of Queen *Elizabeth* and King *James* been troubled with such *Requests and Representations*. It is no strange thing that a weak Eye should be offended with the Light of the Sun. We may justly ascribe the Reviving of the *Arian* Heresy in these later Days to the *Dispensations* of the Court of *Rome*, who licensed ordinary *Priests* to ordain, and confirm, and do the most essential Offices of *Bishops*. So their Schools do teach us, *A Priest may be the extraordinary Minister of Priesthood, and inferiour Orders, by the Delegation of the Pope*. Again, *The Pope may conferr the Power of Confirmation upon a simple Priest*. By such exorbitant Practices as these they chalked out the Way to Innovators. And yet they are not able to produce one Precedent of such a Dispensation throughout the Primitive Times. A good Christian ought to regard more what the whole Christian World in all Ages hath practised, than what a few conceited Persons in this last Age have fancied. Among all the *Eastern, Southern, and Northern* Christians, who make innumerable Multitudes, there neither is, nor ever was one formed Church that wanted Bishops. Yet these are as far from submitting to the exorbitant Power of the *Roman* Bishop, as we. Among all the *Western* Churches and their Colonies, there never was one formed Church for 1500 Years, that wanted Bishops. If there be any Persons so far possessed with Prejudice, that they chuse rather to follow the private Dictates of their own Phrensy, than the perpetual and universal

Practice of the Catholick Church, *enter not into their Secrets, O my Soul!*

Thus far we agree, but in all the Rest of the Circumstances, (though they be not much material) the Fathers do pitifully mistake themselves, and vary much from the Testimony of their Witness, and much more from the Truth. *First*, the Author of this Book was *no Presbyterian Lord*, much less a *Company or Cabal of Presbyterian Lords* in the Plural, but my Lord *Brookes*, one that had as little Favour for *Presbytery*, as for *Episcopacy*.

Secondly, The Book was not presented to the Upper House. It might be brought into the House privately, yet not be presented to the House publickly. If it had been publickly presented, the Clerks of the Parliament or some of them must needs have known of it, and made an Act of it, but they know no such thing. The Lords spiritual and Temporal could not all have Forgotten it, but they remember no such thing, as by their respective Certificates presently shall appear.

Thirdly, As the Author is mistaken, and Presentation mistaken, so the Subject likewise is mistaken. *Sit liber Judex*, Let the Book speak for it self. Thus an able Friend certifieth me; *I have got my Lord Brookes's Book, which he wrote against the Bishops, with much Labour, and persued it with no less Patience. And there is not in it the least Shadow of any Argument, that the Bishops ought not to sit in Parliament, because they had no Succession or Consecration. What did my Lord Brookes regard Succession, or Consecration, or Holy Orders, who had a Coachman to be his Preacher. The less Canonical the Ordination had been, the more he would have applauded it. Time, and Place, and Form, and all were agreeable to that Christian Liberty which he dreamed of, it was not want of Consecration, but Consecration it self which he excepted against, as all Men knew who knew him. And in this Quarrel he lost his Life, after a most remarkable and almost miraculous Manner, at the Siege of Lichfield Church, upon St. Ceadda's Anniversary Day, who was the Founder of that Church, and Bishop of it.*

I know

I know the Fathers will be troubled much, that this which they have published to the View of the World, concerning the Bishop of *Durham*, as a *Truth so evident which no Man can have the Impudence to deny*, should be denied; yea denied positively and throughout; denied not only by the Bishop of *Durham* himself, but by all the Lords Spiritual and Temporal that can be met with; denied by some Lords of their own Communion, who understand themselves as well as any among them, though their Names are not subscribed to the Certificate; denied by the Clerks of the Parliament, whose Office it is to keep a Diary of all the Speeches made in the House of Peers. For Proof hereof, *First*, I produce the Protestation of the Bishop of *Duresme* himself, attested by Witnesses in the Presence of a Publick Notary. Take it in his own Words;

W Hereas I am most injuriously and slanderously traduced, by a Nameless Author, calling himself N. N. in a Book said to be printed at Rouen 1657. intituled [a Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith and Heresy], as if upon the Presenting of a certain Book to the Upper House, in the Beginning of the late Parliament, proving, as he saith, the Protestant Bishops had no Succession nor Consecration, and therefore were no Bishops, and by Consequence ought not to sit in Parliament, I should make a Speech against the said Book in my own and all the Bishops behalfs, endeavouring to prove Succession from the last Catholick Bishops, (as he there styles them,) who by Imposition of Hands ordained the first Protestant Bishops, at the Naggs-head in Cheapside, as was notorious to all the World, &c.

I do hereby, in the Presence of Almighty God, solemnly protest and declare to all the World, that what this Author there affirms concerning me, is a most notorious Untruth, and a gross Slander. For to the best of my Knowledge and Remembrance, no such Book as he there mentions, was ever presented to the Upper House in that or any other Parliament, that ever I sat in; And if there had, I could never have made such a Speech as is there pretended, seeing I have ever spoken according to my Thoughts, and always believed that Fable of the Naggs-head Consecration to have proceeded from the Father of Lies; as

the Authentick Records of the Church still extant, which were so faithfully transcribed, and published by Mr. Mason, do evidently testify. And whereas the same impudent Libeller doth moreover say, that what he there affirms, was told to many, by one of the ancientest Peers of England, present in Parliament, when I made this pretended Speech: and that he is ready to depose the same upon his Oath: And that he cannot believe, any will be so impudent, to deny a thing so notorious, whereof there are as many Witnesses living, as there are Lords and Bishops who were that Day in the Upper House of Parliament, &c. I answer, that I am very unwilling to believe any Peer of England should have so little Sense of his Conscience and Honour, as either to swear or so much as affirm such a notorious Untruth. And therefore, for the Justification of my self and Manifestation of the Truth in this Particular, I do freely and willingly appeal (as he directs me) to those honourable Persons, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal yet alive, who sat in the House of Peers in that Parliament, or to as many of them as this my Protestation shall come to, for a true Certificate of what they know or believe concerning this Matter. Humbly desiring them and charging it upon their Souls, as they will answer it to God at the Day of Judgment, that they will be pleased to testify the Truth, and nothing but the Truth herein, to the best of their Knowledge and Remembrance, without any Favour or Affection to me at all. I cannot reasonably be suspected by any indifferent Man, of denying any thing that I know or believe to be true, seeing I am so shortly, in all Probability, to render an Account to the Searcher of Hearts of all my Words and Actions, being now (at the least) upon the ninety fifth Year of my Age. And I acknowledge it a great Mercy and Favour of God, that he hath reserved me thus long, to clear the Church of England and my self of this most notorious Slander, before he takes me to himself. For I cannot imagine any Reason, why this shameless Writer might not have cast the same upon any of my Reverend Brethren as well as me, but only that I being the eldest, it was probable I might be in my Grave, before this Untruth could be taken notice of in the World. And now, I thank God, I can cheerfully sing my nunc dimittis, unless it please him to reserve me for the like Service hereafter: for I desire

desire not to live any longer upon Earth, than he shall be pleased to make me his Instrument to defend the Truth, and promote his Glory. And for the more solemn and full Confirmation of this my free and voluntary Protestation and Declaration, I have herunto set my Hand and Seal, this seventeenth Day of July, Anno Domini 1658.

THOMAS DURESME,

Signed, sealed, published and declared, in the Presence of Tho. Sanders Sen.; Tho. Sanders Jun., John Barwick Clerk, R. Gray, Evan Davies.

I Tobias Holder, publick Notary, being requested by the Right Reverend Father in God, Thomas Lord Bishop of Duresme, at the House of Thomas Sanders Esquire, in the Parish of Flamstead, in the County of Hertford, in the Year of our Lord, Month and Day above-specified, was then and there personally present, where and when the said Reverend Bishop did Sign, publish and declare this his Protestation and Declaration above-written, to be his Act and Deed, and did cause his Authentick Episcopal Seal, to be thereto affixed, in the Presence of the Witnesses, whose Names are thereto subscribed. And did there and then likewise sign, publish and declare as his Act and Deed, another of the same Tenor written in Paper, which he signed with his Manual Seal, in the Presence of the same Witnesses. All this I heard, saw, and therefore know to be done. In Testimony whereof I have subscribed, and thereto put my usual and accustomed Notaries Sign.

TOBIAS HOLDER.

Publick Notary.

How doth this so solemn Protestation agree with the former Relation of the Fathers, that the Bishop of Durham affirmed publickly in the Upper House, that the first Protestant Bishops were Consecrated in the Naggs-Head; that they were not Consecrated at Lambeth; that this was notorious to all the World; that it is not Credible, that any will be so impudent as to deny it; that all the Rest of the Bishops approved
his

his Assertion by their Silence, and were glad to have such a retiring Place against the Presbyterians, that none of the Bishops did give Credit to Mr. Mason's new found Registers? Even as Light and Darknes, or Truth and Falshood, or two contradictory Propositions do agree together. This is the first Witness, whom any of that Party hath adventured to cite publickly and directly for that infamous Story, whilst he was living. And they see the Success of it. I hope they will be wiser hereafter, than to cite any more living Witnesses.

But it may be, that they who do not stick to suppose, that our Archbishops *make false Certificates*, may object, this is but the Testimony of the Bishop of *Durham* in his own Cause. Let us see, whether the other Bishops dissent from the Bishop of *Durham*. Take the Testimony of them all, who sat in that Parliament, which are now living, except the Bishop of *Bangor*, whose Absence in *Wales* is the only Reason, why he is not a Subscriber with the Rest.

W Hereas we, the surviving Bishops of the Church of England, who sat in the Parliament, begun at Westminster the third Day of November 1640, are required by our Reverend Brother the Lord Bishop of Duresme, to declare and attest the Truth, concerning an Imputation cast upon him in the Pamphlet of that Nameless Author, mentioned in his Protestation and Declaration here prefixed. And whereas we are obliged to perform what he requesteth, both for the Justification of the Truth, and for the clearing of our selves of another slanderous Aspersiō, which the same Author casteth upon us, as if we had heard our said Reverend Brother, make such a Speech as is there pretended, and by our Silence had approved, what that Libeller falsely affirmeth was delivered in it. We do hereby solemnely protest and declare before God and all the World; that we never knew of any such Book presented to the House of Peers, as he there pretendeth, nor believe, any such was ever presented: And therefore could never bear any such Speech made against it, as he mentioneth, by our said Reverend Brother or any other; much less approve of it by our Silence.

And

And if any such Book had been presented, or any such Speech had been made, there is none among us so ignorant or negligent of his Duty in defending the Truth, but would have been both able and ready to have confuted so groundless a Fable, as the pretended Consecration of Bishops at the Naggs-Head, out of the Authentick and known Registers of the Church still extant, mentioned and faithfully transcribed and published by Mr. Mason so long before. For the Confirmation of which Truth, and Attestation of what our said Reverend Brother hath herewith protested and declared, we have hereunto set our Hands. Dated the 19th Day of July, Anno Domini 1658.

LONDON. BATH. and WELLS.
M. ELI. JO. ROFFENS.
BR. SARUM. OXFORD.

If all these Proofs seem not satisfactory to the Fathers, they shall have more. Let them take the Testimony of the Principal Peers now living, who sat then in Parliament.

WE of the Lords Temporal, whose Names are here underwritten, who sat in the Parliament, begun at Westminster the third Day of November 1640, being desired by the Bishop of Duresme, to testify our Knowledge concerning an Imputation cast upon him, about a Speech pretended to be made by him in that Parliament, more particularly mentioned and disavowed in his prefixed Protestation, Do hereby Testify and Declare, that to the best of our present Knowledge and Remembrance, no such Book against Bishops, as is there mentioned, was presented to the House of Peers in that Parliament. And consequently, that no such Speech as is there pretended, was or could be made by him or any other against it. In Testimony whereof we have signed this our Attestation with our own Hands. Dated the nineteenth Day of July, Anno Domini 1658.

DORCHESTER. LINDSEY.
RUTLAND. SOUTHAMPTON.
LINCOLNE. DEVONSHIRE.
CLEVELAND. MONMOUTH.
DOVER.

To this Proof nothing remaineth that can be added, but only the Testimony of the Clerk of the Parliament, who, after a diligent Search made in the Book of the Lords House, hath with his own Hand written this short Certificate, in the Margent of one of your Books pag. 9. over against your Relation.

UPON Search made in the Book of the Lords House, I do not find any such Book presented, nor any Entry of any such Speech made by Bishop Morton.

HENRY SCOBEL, CLERK
of the Parliament.

And now, methinks, I hear the Fathers blaming their own Credulity and Rashness, and over-much Confidence. They had forgotten Epictetus his Rule, *Remember to distrust.* I judge them by my self, *Homo sum, humani à me nihil alienum puto.* One Circumstance being either latent or mistaken, may change the whole Drift and Scope of a Relation. But though we would be contented to lend a Skirt of our Coat, to cover the Fault of them who calumniate our Church: yet this Relation can never be excused in any Man from a most grievous Mistake, where both the Person, and the whole Scope of his Discourse is altogether Mistaken. This is almost as great a Mistake as the Naggs-head Ordination it self, where a Confirmation-Dinner was mistaken for a solemn Consecration. But those who cherish such Mistakes for Advantage, and deck them up with new Matter, and publish them to the World for undoubted Truths, cannot be excused from formal Calumny.

The last thing to be considered in this first part of this Discourse, being the Vindication of the Reverend Bishop of Duresme, is concerning the Witness, whom as the Fathers do forbear to name, so shall I. A OF whom they say four things, that he is one of the Antientest Peers of England; that he was present in Parliament when Morton made this Speech; that he will take his Oath of the Truth of it; and that

that he cannot believe that any will be so impudent to deny it. We have no Dispute concerning the Antiquity of Peerage, Let that pass : but I am confident, whatsoever his present Judgment had been, either of the Speaker or of the Speech, your Witness would have abstained from uncivil Language, as to stile the Reverend Bishop of *Duresme* a pretended Bishop, and plain *Morton*, without either Welt or Gard. He would not have forgotten all his Degrees both in the Church and in the Schools. He will not charge all of them with down right *Impudence*, who tell him that he was doubly mistaken : Nor call that notorious to all the World, which he himself acknowledgeth that he never heard of before in his Life. He is not guilty of those Inferences, and *eo nomine's* which you have added. I do not believe that he doth, or ever did know the Bishop of *Duresme* so well as to swear this is the Man : Nor doth take himself to be so exact an Analyser of a Discourse, as to be able to take his Oath what was the true Scope of it, *pro* or *contra* ; especially when some thing is started that doth quite divert his Attention, as the Sound of the Market-Bell did the Philosopher's Auditors.

This is my Charity. And my Ground for it is this, When I had once Conference with him about this Relation, he told me, the Name of the *Naggs-head* did surprise him, and he betook himself to enquire of another what it meant. And when I urged to him, that it was incredible, that any Protestant Bishop should make such a Speech, unless he used it only by way of Supposition, as *argumentum ad hominem*, a Reason fit for my Lord *Brookes*, that such a Consecration as that was, agreed well enough with his Principles. He told me he knew not that, the Bishop might answer so for himself.

To conclude, I have heard the Bishop of *Lincoln* did once mention the Fable of the *Naggs-head* in a Speech in Parliament, but with as much Detestation of it, as our Ancestors used to name the Devil. Why might not the Mistake both of the Person, and of the Drift or Scope of his Speech, be the Occasion of this Relation?

I had

I had rather, out of Charity, run into two such right-handed Errors, than condemn a Noble Gentleman, of whose Ingenuity I never had any Reason to doubt, of a malicious Lie. Take it at the very best, the Mistake is great enough, to mistake both the Person of the Speaker, and the Scope of his Speech. I hope they will all do that which in Conscience they are obliged to do, that is, acquit the Bishop of *Duresme*, and crave his Pardon for their Mistake. If they do not, the World will acquit him, and condemn them. But the greatest Mistake of all others was, to publish such a notorious Untruth to the World, so temerariouſly without better Advice.

C H A P. III.

Three Reasons against the Naggs-head Consecration,
 1. *From the Contradictions of the Relaters;* 2. *From the Lateness of the Discovery;* 3. *From the Strictness of our Laws.*

NOW having beaten down the Pillar about their Ears, which they had set up to underprop their Naggs-head Ordination, it remaineth next to assault the main Fable it self, as it is related by these Fathers. Having told, how the Protestant Doctors who were designed for Bishopricks in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, had prevailed with Anthony Kitchin Bishop of Landaff, to give them a Meeting at the Naggs-head in Cheapside, in hopes he would ordain them Bishops there. And how the Bishop of Landaff, through Bishop Bonner's Threatnings refused, (all which shall be examined and laid open to the View of the World in due Order, how it is stuffed with Untruth and Absurdities.) They add, that being thus deceived of their Expectation, and having no other Means to come to their Desires (that is, to obtain Consecration), they resolved to use Mr. Scory's Help, an Apostate religious Priest, who having borne the Name of Bishop in King Edward the sixth's Time, was thought to have sufficient Power

to perform that Office, especially in such a strait Necessary as they pretended. He, having cast off, together with his religious Habit, all Scruple of Conscience, willingly went about the Matter, which he performed in this Sort; Having the Bible in his Hand, and they all kneeling before him, he laid it upon every one of their Heads or Shoulders, saying, take thou Authority to preach the Word of God sincerely. And so they rose up Bishops of the new Church of England. This Narration of the Consecration at the Naggs-Head (they say) they have taken out of Holywood, Constable, and Dr. Champney's Works. They might as well have taken it out of *Æsops Fables*, and with as much Credit or Expectation of Truth on our parts.

So the Controversy between them and us is this; They say that Arch-Bishop Parker, and the rest of the Protestant Bishops, in the Beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, or at the least sundry of them, were consecrated at the Naggs-head in Cheapside together, by Bishop Scory alone, or by him and Bishop Barlow jointly, without Sermon, without Sacrament, without any Solemnity, in the Year 1559, (but they know not what Day, nor before what publick Notaries,) by a new phantastick Form. And all this they say upon the supposed voluntary Report of Mr. Neale (a single malicious Spie,) in private to his own Party, long after the Business pretended to be done.

We say, Archbishop Parker was consecrated alone, at Lambeth, in the Church, by four Bishops, authorized thereunto by Commission under the Great Seal of England, with Sermon, with Sacrament, with all due Solemnities, upon the 17th Day of December, Anno 1559, before four of the most eminent publick Notaries in England; and particularly by the same publick Notary, who was principal A&uary both at Cardinal Pole's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's. And that all the rest of the Bishops were Consecrated at other Times, some in the same Month, but not upon the same Day, some in the same Year, but not the same Month, and some the Year following. And to prove the Truth of our Relation

I had rather, out of Charity, run into two such right-handed Errors, than condemn a Noble Gentleman, of whose Ingenuity I never had any Reason to doubt, of a malicious Lie. Take it at the very best, the Mistake is great enough, to mistake both the Person of the Speaker, and the Scope of his Speech. I hope they will all do that which in Conscience they are obliged to do, that is, acquit the Bishop of *Duresme*, and crave his Pardon for their Mistake. If they do not, the World will acquit him, and condemn them. But the greatest Mistake of all others was, to publish such a notorious Untruth to the World, so temerarily without better Advice.

C H A P. III.

Three Reasons against the Naggs-head Consecration,

1. *From the Contradictions of the Relaters;* 2. *From the Lateness of the Discovery;* 3. *From the Strictness of our Laws.*

NOW having beaten down the Pillar about their Ears, which they had set up to underprop their Naggs-head Ordination, it remaineth next to assault the main Fable it self, as it is related by these Fathers. Having told, how the Protestant Doctors who were designed for Bishopricks in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, had prevailed with Anthony Kitchin Bishop of Landaff, to give them a Meeting at the Naggs-head in Cheapside, in hopes he would ordain them Bishops there. And how the Bishop of Landaff, through Bishop Bonner's Threatnings refused, (all which shall be examined and laid open to the View of the World in due Order, how it is stuffed with Untruth and Absurdities.) They add, that being thus deceived of their Expectation, and having no other Means to come to their Desires (that is, to obtain Consecration), they resolved to use Mr. Scory's Help, an Apostate religious Priest, who having borne the Name of Bishop in King Edward the sixth's Time, was thought to have sufficient Power

to perform that Office, especially in such a strait Necessary as they pretended. He, having cast off, together with his religious Habit, all Scruple of Conscience, willingly went about the Matter, which he performed in this Sort; Having the Bible in his Hand, and they all kneeling before him, he laid it upon every one of their Heads or Shoulders, saying, take thou Authority to preach the Word of God sincerely. And so they rose up Bishops of the new Church of England. This Narration of the Consecration at the Naggs-Head (they say) they have taken out of Holywood, Constable, and Dr. Champney's Works. They might as well have taken it out of *Aesops Fables*, and with as much Credit or Expectation of Truth on our parts.

So the Controversy between them and us is this; They say that Arch-Bishop Parker, and the rest of the Protestant Bishops, in the Beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, or at the least sundry of them, were consecrated at the Naggs-head in Cheapside together, by Bishop Scory alone, or by him and Bishop Barlow jointly, without Sermon, without Sacrament, without any Solemnity, in the Year 1559, (but they know not what Day, nor before what publick Notaries,) by a new phantastick Form. And all this they say upon the supposed voluntary Report of Mr. Neale (a single malicious Spie,) in private to his own Party, long after the Business pretended to be done.

We say, Archbishop Parker was consecrated alone, at Lambeth, in the Church, by four Bishops, authorized thereunto by Commission under the Great Seal of England, with Sermon, with Sacrament, with all due Solemnities, upon the 17th Day of December, Anno 1559, before four of the most eminent publick Notaries in England; and particularly by the same publick Notary, who was principal A&uary both at Cardinal Pole's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's. And that all the rest of the Bishops were Consecrated at other Times, some in the same Month, but not upon the same Day, some in the same Year, but not the same Month, and some the Year following. And to prove the Truth of our Relation

tion, and Falshood of theirs, we produce the Register of the See of *Canterbury*, as authentick as the World hath any, the Registers of the other fourteen Sees then vacant; all as carefully kept by sworn Officers as the Records of the Vatican it self. We produce all the Commissions under the Privy Seal and Great Seal of *England*: We produce the Rolls or Records of the Chancery; And if the Records of the Signet-Office had not been unfortunately burned in King *James* his Time, it might have been verified by those also: We produce an Act of Parliament express in the Point, within seven Years after the Consecration: We produce all the controverted Consecrations published to the World in Print, A. 1572, three Years before Archbishop *Parker's* Death, whilst all things were fresh in Mens Memories. These bright Beams had been able to dazle the Eyes of Mr. *Neale* himself, whilst he was living, and have made him recant his lewd Lie, or confess himself stark blind.

The first Reason.

The first Reason which I bring against this ridiculous Fable, is taken from the palpable Contradictions, and gross Absurdities and Defects of those *Roman* Catholick Writers, who have related this silly Tale of a Tub, and agree in nothing but in their common Malice against the Church of *England*. It is no strange Matter for such as write upon Hear-say, or relie upon the exact Truth of other Mens Notes or Memories, to mistake in some inconsiderable Circumstance, as to set down the Name of a Place amiss, which may be the Transcribers Fault, or the Printers, as well as the Authors; Or to say two Suffragans for one, when there were two named in the Commission, and but one present at the Consecration. Such immaterial Differences, which are so remote from the Heart of the Cause, about indifferent Circumstances, may bring the Exactness of the Relation into Question, but not the substantial Truth of it. Such petty insignificant Variations, do rather prove that the Relations were not made upon Compact or Confederacy. Especially where there are original Records
taken

taken upon the Place by sworn Notaries, whose Names, and Hands, and Acts are as well known to every Man vers'd in the Records of those Times, as a Man knoweth his own House. To which all Relators and Relations must submit, and are ready to submit, as to an infallible Rule.

But he who should give Credit to such a silly senseless Fable as this is, which is wholly composed of absurd, improbable, incoherent, inconsistent, contradictory Fictions, had need to have a very implicit Faith. The greatest shew of any Accord among them is about the Consecrator, yet even in this they disagree one from another. The common Opinion is that Bishop *Scory* alone did consecrate them. But Mr. *Constable*, one of their principal Authors, supposeth that Bishop *Barlow* might join with him in the Consecration. And *Saunders*, whose Pen in other Cases useth to run over, one who had as much Malice as any of them, and had Reason to know the Passages of those Times better than all of them, leaveth it doubtful, when, or where, or by whom they were ordain'd, *quomodocunque facti sunt isti Pseudo-Episcopi* ; by what means soever they were Ordain'd.

But they disagree much more among themselves, who they should be that were Ordain'd. First, Mr. *Wadsworth* (whose Ingenuity deserveth to be commended) doth not say that any of our Bishops were actually Consecrated there, but only that it is evident, by the Records, that Archbishop *Parker* was not personally Present at his Confirmation in *Bow Church*, or at his Confirmation Dinner at the *Nagg's-Head*, which gave the Occasion to this merry Legend : But was confirmed by his Proctor *Nicholas Bullingham* Doctor in the Laws, upon the Ninth of December, Anno 1559. A Man may be Confirmed by Proxy, but no Man can be Ordain'd by Proxy. It is a ruled Case in the Law, *Non licet Sacramentum aliquod præter matrimonium absenti administrare*. So if there was an attempt to Consecrate any Man at the *Nagg's-Head*, it must be Doctor *Bullingham*, it could not be Arch-bishop *Parker*.

Others say there was more than an Attempt, that one or more of them were actually Ordain'd there : But they name none. Others name some, but they accord not one with another in naming of them. Some say, *Jewel, Sands, Horn, Grindal* ; where was Archbishop *Parker* ? Others say, they were all Ordained there, who were named to Bishopricks, and number Fifteen of them. These Fathers speak indefinitely, *Parker and his Fellows*. But they seem to extend this Word *Fellows* as far as Doctor *Champney's* Fifteen : For they tell us, that they *all kneeled down before him, and he laid the Bible upon every one of their Heads or Shoulders*. Thus these *Cadmean Brethren*, like those false Witnesses which testified against Christ, destroy one another with their mutual Contradictions.

Thirdly, The Time is a principal Circumstance in all Consecrations, and is evermore most punctually recorded by the Actuaries, or publick Notaries. But in this fabulous Relation the Time is concealed. It seemeth the Forger was no good Actuary, and either did not know how material that Circumstance was, or had forgotten it. Only Doctor *Champney* telleth us, that it was before the ninth of *September, Anno 1559*. But this is not precise enough for an Act: and moreover, it is most apparently false and impossible. For whereas there are two Commissions under the great Seal of *England*, for the Confirmation and Consecration of Archbishop *Parker*, both recorded in the Rolls ; the one which was not executed, dated the said very Ninth Day of *September* ; and the other which was executed, dated the Sixth Day of *December* following : If Doctor *Champney* said true, Archbishop *Parker* was consecrated before there was any Commission out, either for his Consecration or Confirmation ; which is one of the drowsiest Dreams that could drop from an English Pen.

Lastly, Every Consecration must be performed before one or more publick Notaries. (We shall shew them Notaries enough of great Eminence, beyond all exception, for Archbishop *Parker's* true Consecration.) And indeed what could a Consecration avail any Man, without a publick Notary to Record it, to make an authentick

authentick Certificate of it under the Seal of the principal Consecrator? Now who recorded the *Nagg's-Head* Consecration? Who drew it up into Acts? Who certified it? No Body; because the silly Forger did not understand what things were requisite to a Consecration. Only, as the *Athenians* sometimes said of *Metiochus*, *Metiochus grinds the Corn, Metiochus bakes the Bread, Metiochus mends the Highways, Metiochus doth all, an evil Year to Metiochus*: So we may say of Mr. Neale; Mr. Neale was the Spie, Mr. Neale was the Witness, Mr. Neale was the publick Notary, Mr. Neale was the chief Enginier or Forger, Mr. Neale was all, what Honours are due to Mr. Neale?

Qui tot sustinuit, qui tanta negotia solus.

So they feign a Consecration without a publick Notary, or (which is all one) no Man ever knew who that publick Notary was; at a Time impossible, or else no Man knoweth at what Time; without any Certainty who consecrated, whether *Scory* alone, or *Scory* and *Barlow* together, or God knows who; and yet with much less Certainty who were Consecrated, whether none at all, but only an Attempt was made, or one, and who that one was; or some indefinitely, without naming who they were, or how many they were; or Four expressly, but dissenting one from another who those Four were. Here is a Story composed altogether of Uncertainties and Contradictions, like a *Man and no Man, bit a Bird and no Bird, on a Tree and no Tree, with a Stone and no Stone*: To make this uncertain, groundless, contradictory Rumour, to be the Touchstone of Truth, and to over-balance all the authentick Records of the Kingdom, in a matter of such publick Concernment, is just as to make the Parish-Clock go truer than the Sun, because the Clerk who sets it is our Friend.

My second Reason against this senseless Fable, is the late Discovery of it to the *second Reason*. World, and the long concealing of it in Holes and Corners before they durst adventure to present it to the View of the World. Can any Man, who is in his right Wits, be so stupid as to imagine, that

the *Nagg's-Head* Ordination happen'd in the Year 1559 and (if these Fathers say truly) was *notoriously known to all the World*; and that it should never once peep into the Light for almost a whole Age after it was pretended to have been done, that is, not till after the Year Sixteen Hundred? We use to say a Monster is but nine Days Wonder: But this ugly Monster was not taken Notice of in the World until after Forty Years. The Reason is evident; either it was then but newly hatch'd, or it had been kept all that time at dry Nurse in a Closet. If it had been so *notorious to all the World* from the Year 1559 as the Fathers feign, all the Windows in the *Nagg's-Head* would have been full of it, and the Room would have been shewed to all their Guests, where such a prodigious Pageant had been acted.

I dare appeal to the Judgments of these Fathers themselves, whether it be Credible, that this Story should be notoriously known to the World in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, and yet neither *Stapleton*, nor *Harding*, nor *Bristow*, nor *Alan*, nor *Reynolds*, nor *Parsons*, nor any one of all their Roman Catholick Writers should so much as mention it for Forty Years ensuing; especially writing so much as they did upon that very Subject, the Validity or Invalidity of our Ordination. How could their silence have been excused from betraying of their Cause, to lose such an egregious Advantage? Was it peradventure out of Affection to us, to conceal the Defects of the Protestants? No, they had Malice enough, but they durst not avouch such a monstrous Untruth in earnest, (if ever they did hear of such a vain Rumour, which I cannot easily believe,) so contrary to the Knowledge of that Age.

Especially let them tell me how it comes to pass, that *Nicolas Saunders*, who professeth to write the *Ecclesiastical History of England*, from the One and Twentieth Year of Henry the VIII. until the Eight and Twentieth Year of Queen Elizabeth then current, in his Three Books of the *Original Schism*, hath not one Syllable of the *Nagg's-Head* Ordination? He was never accused of Partiality for the Pro-

Protestants; (but as malicious against the Protestants as any Man could wish); nor of concealing Truths to their Advantage, but of devising Fables to their Prejudice.

He having related the Form of our English Consecrations, partly True and partly False, proceedeth to this first Ordination of Protestant Bishops, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign; alledging that

the Catholick Bishops refused to impose Hands upon them, And that they had not of themselves two or three Bishops, or so much as one Metropolitan.

*De Schism.
Angl. l. 3. p.
400. Edit.
Rom.*

What a shameless Untruth is this, that there were not two or three Protestant Bishops, when the Queen's Commission under the great Seal of England, recorded in the Rolls, is directed to seven Protestant Bishops, expressly by their Names and Titles?

He addeth, that *they were very instant with an Irish Archbishop to have presided at their Ordination, but he would not.* He mistaketh the matter altogether. They might have had seven Irish Archbishops and Bishops if they had needed them; where the Proceedings were not so rigorous, where the old Bishops complied and held their Places, and joined in such Ecclesiastical Acts, until they had made away to their Kindred all the Lands belonging to their Sees. We found one Bishoprick reduced to five Marks a Year by these Temporizers, another to forty Shillings a Year, and all of them to very poor Pittances for Prelates. But by this means there wanted no Ordainers: Never did any Man question the Ordination of the first Protestant Bishops in Ireland until this day.

Then he telleth, how being thus rejected by the Catholick Bishops and the Irish Archbishop, they applied themselves to the Lay Magistrate in the ensuing Parliament for a Confirmation, from whence they were called Parliamentary Bishops. By whom were they called so? By no Man but himself and his Fellows. How many Ordinations were passed over, one after another, before that Parliament; Was there any thing moved in this Parliament, concerning any the least Essential of our Episcopal Ordination? Not at all, but only concerning repealing and reviving of an English Statute. English

Statute

Statutes cannot change the Essentials of Ordination, either to make that Consecration valid which was invalid, or that invalid which was valid. The Validity or Invalidity of Ordination, dependeth not upon human Laws, but upon the Institution of Christ. Neither did we ever since that Parliament change one Syllable in our Form of Ordination. Then what was this Confirmation which he speaks of? It was onely a Declaration of the Parliament, that all the Objections which these Men made against our Ordinations, were Slanders and Calumnies : and that all the Bishops which had been Ordained in the Queen's Time, had been rightly Ordained, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of *England*, and the Laws of the Land. These Men want no Confidence, who are not ashamed to cite this Statute in this Case. But we shall meet with this Parliament again.

In all this impertinent Discourse, where is the Fable of the *Nagg's-Head* Ordination? It had been a Thousand times more material than all this *Fargon*. And you may be sure it had not been missing, if there had been the least grain of Truth in it, or if there had but been any Suspicion of it when that was written. It was not then full Thirty Years after Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration, and there were store of Eye-Witnesses living to have hissed such a senseless Fable out of the World. And therefore *Sanders* very prudently for himself, after so many intimations, passeth by their Ordination in a deep Silence, which was the onely work he took in hand to shew. *Qualescunque fuerint, aut quomodocunque facti sint isti Pseudo-Episcopi, &c.* What manner of Persons soever these False-Bishops were, or after what manner soever they were Ordained, &c. If Bishop *Scory* had Ordain'd them all at the *Nagg's-Head*, by laying a Bible upon their Heads, and this Form of Words, *Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God sincerely*, Mr. *Sanders* needed not to have left the Case so doubtful, how they were Ordained. And if there had been the least Suspicion of it, he would have blown it abroad upon a Silver Trumpet : but God be thanked there was none. The
universal

universal Silence of the Romish Writers of that Age, when the *Nagg's-Head* Ordination is pretended to have been done, in a Case which concerned them all so nearly, and which was the chief Subject of all their Disputes; is a convincing Proof to all Men, who are not altogether possessed with Prejudice, that either it was devised long after, or was so lewd a Lye, that no Man dared to own it, whilst Thousands of Eye-witnesses of Arch-bishop *Parker's* true Consecration at *Lambeth* were living.

A Third Reason, against this ridiculous Libel of the *Nagg's-Head* Consecration, is taken from *The Third Reason.* the Strictness of our Laws, which allow no Man to Consecrate or be Consecrated but in a sacred Place, with due Matter and Form, and all the Rites and Ceremonies prescribed by the Church of *England*. No Man must be Consecrated by fewer then Four Bishops, or Three at least; and that after the Election of the Dean and Chapter is duely confirmed; and upon the Mandate or Commission of the King under the great Seal of *England*; under the Pain of a *Præmunire*, that is, *25. Hen. 8. c. 20.* the Forfeiture of Lands, Goods, Liberty, and Protection. They allow not Consecration in a Tavern, without due Matter or Form, without the Ceremonies and Solemnity prescribed by the Church, without Election, without Confirmation, without Letters Patents, by one single Bishop, or two at the most; such as they feign the *Nagg's-Head* Ordination to have been. Who can believe, that two Arch-bishops and thirteen Bishops, having the Reputation of Learning and Prudence, should wilfully thrust themselves into an apparent *Præmunire*, to forfeit not only their Archbishopricks and Bishopricks, but all their Estates and all their Hopes, for a phantastick Form, and scandalous Consecration, when the Queen and Kingdom were favourable to them, when the Form prescribed by the Church did please them well enough, when there were Protestant Bishops of their own Communion enough to Consecrate them, when all the Churches in the Kingdom were open to them; unless it had been

Midsummer Moon in *December*, and they are all stark Mad, and then it is no matter where they were Consecrated ?

In criminal Causes, where things are pretended to be done against penal Laws, such as this is, the Proofs ought to be clearer than the Noon Day Light. Here is nothing proved, but one single Witness named, and he a professed Enemy, who never testified it upon Oath, or before a Judge, or so much as a publick Notary, or to the Face of a Protestant, but only whispered it in Corners (as it is said by Adversaries) among some of his own Party. Such a Testimony is not worth a deaf Nut, in any Cause between Party and Party. If he had been a Witness beyond all Exception, and had been duly Sworn and legally Examined, yet this Testimony, in the most favourable Cause, had been but half a Proof, though an Hundred did testify it from his Mouth, it is still but a single Testimony ; and as it is, it is plain prittle prattle, and ought to be valued no more than the shadow of an Ass. To admit such a Testimony, or an Hundred such Testimonies, against the publick authentick Records of the Kingdom, were to make our selves guilty of more Madness, than they accuse the Bishops of. If *St. Paul* forbid *Timothy* to receive an Accusation against a single Presbyter, under two or three Witnesses, he would not have us to condemn fifteen Bishops of such a penal Crime, upon a ridiculous Rumour, contrary both to the Laws and Records of the Kingdom. The Severity of our Laws doth destroy the Credit of this Fable.

C H A P. III.

The fourth and fifth Reasons against this improbable Fiction, from the no Necessity of it, and the less Advantage of it.

MY Fourth Plea is, because there was no need to play this counterfeit Pageant. We use to say Necessity hath no Law. In time of War the Laws are
silent

silent, but this was a time of Peace. First there could be no Necessity why they should have a clandestine Consecration, without a Register or publick Notary, when they might have had an Army of publick Notaries ready upon their whistle, even under their Elbows, at Bow Church, out of the Courts of the *Arches*, and the *Audience*, and *Prerogative*. Secondly, there was no necessity why they should anticipate the Queens *Letters Patents* for their Consecration, by whose gracious Favour they were elected, and of the Accomplishment whereof, in due time, they could not doubt; unless they would wilfully destroy their own Hopes, by such a mad Prank as this had been, that is, unless they would themselves hew down the Bough whereupon they stood. Thirdly, there was no Necessity that they should chuse a common Tavern for the Place of their Consecration, when the Keys of all the Churches in the Kingdom were at their Command. Fourthly, there could be no Necessity why they should desert the Form of Ordination prescribed by the Law, which was agreeable both to their Judgments, and to their Desires, and to their Duties; and to omit the Essentials of Ordination, both as to Matter and Form, which they knew well enough, to be Consecrated after a new brainsick Manner.

Then all the Necessity which can be pretended, is Want of a competent Number of Ordainers. Suppose there had been such a Necessity to be Ordained by two Bishops, or by one Bishop, this very Necessity had been a sufficient Dispensation with the Rigour of the Canons, and had justified the Act; as St. Gregory pleadeth to *Augustine*, *In the English Church* Resp. Int. 8.
wherein there is no other Bishop but thy self, thou August.
canst not Ordain a Bishop otherwise than alone. And after this manner our First English Bishops were Ordained. And so might these Protestant Bishops have been validly Ordained, if they received the Essentials of Ordination: But what a Remedy is this? because they could not have a competent number of Bishops, according to the Canons of the Church, and the Laws of *England*,
there.

therefore to reject the Essentials of Ordination, for a Defect which was not Essential, and to cast off Obedience to their Superiours, both Civil and Ecclesiastical ? This had been just like little Children which, because they cannot have some Toy which they desire, cast away their Garments, and whatsoever their Parents had provided for them ; Want of three Bishops might, in some Cases, make a Consecration illegal or uncanonical, but it could not have rendered it invalid, as this silly pretended Ordination had.

But now I come up close to the ground-work of the Fable, and I deny positively that there was any such Want of a competent Number of Bishops, as they pretend. And for Proof hereof I bring no vain Rumours or uncertain Conjectures, but the evident and authentick Testimony of the great Seal of *England*, affixed to the Queens *Letters Patents*, for authorising the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch-bishop *Parker*, dated the sixth Day of *December*, Anno 1559, directed to Seven Protestant Bishops, namely, *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*, *William Barlow* sometime Bishop of *Bath and Wells*, and the Elect Bishop of *Chichester*, *John Scory* sometime Bishop of *Chichester*, then Elect Bishop of *Hereford*, *Miles Coverdale* sometimes Bishop of *Exeter*, *John Suffragan Bishop of Bedford*, *John Suffragan Bishop of Thetford*, and *John Bale* Bishop of *Ossory* in *Ireland*. Three are a Canonical Number, if there were Choice of Seven, then there was no Want of a competent Number to Ordain canonically. I add, that, if it had been needful, they might have had Seven more out of *Ireland*, Arch-bishops and Bishops, for such a Work as a Consecration. *Ireland* never wanted store of Ordainers, Nor ever yet did any Man object, Want of a competent Number of Consecrators, to an Irish Protestant Bishop. They who concurred freely in the Consecration of Protestant Bishops at home, would not have denied their Concurrence in *England*, if they had been commanded. Which makes me give no Credit to their vain Report, of an Irish Arch-bishop

Rot. 14. Pars
2. Elizab.

bishop Prisoner in the Tower, who refused to comply with the Desires of the Protestant Bishops, *for his Liberty and a large Reward*. But the Arch-bishop wanteth a Name, and the Fable wanteth a Ground; the Witnesses and Persuaders are all unknown. And, if there had been a Grain of Truth in this Relation; yet in this Case one Man is no Man, one Man's Refusal signifieth nothing.

Against the evident Truth of this Assertion, two things may be opposed out of the Relation of these Fathers. The First is particular, concerning the Bishop of *Landaff*, that he was no Protestant, but a Roman Catholick until his Death. So they say indeed, that *he was the only Man of all the Catholick Bishops, that took the Oath of Supremacy*. Observe how Prejudice and Partiality doth blindfold Men of Learning and Parts; they confess he took the Oath of Supremacy, and yet esteem him a good Roman Catholick. I see Censures go by Favour, and one may steal an Horse, better than another look over the Hedge. I am well contented, that they reckon him for so good a Catholick.

They add, that *he knew Parker and the rest which were to be ordered Bishops to be Hereticks, and averse from the Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church, which he Constantly adhered unto, (the Supremacy only excepted) during his Life*. And a little after they tell us, that *he desired to be numbred among Catholicks*. Now what if the Bishop of *Landaff*, after all this, should prove to be a Protestant? Then all the Fathers Story is quite spoiled. And so he was. If he knew *Parker* and the rest to be Hereticks, he knew himself to be one of their Brother Hereticks. His daily Mass was the English Liturgy, as well as theirs. He adhered constantly to a Protestant Bishoprick during his Life, as well as any of them; and if he did not hold it as long as any of them, it was Death's Fault, and none of his Fault.

They say, *they prevailed with him to give them a meeting at the Nagg's-Head in Cheapside, where they hoped he would Ordain them Bishops, despairing that ever he would do it in*

a Church, because that would be too great and notorious a Scandal for Catholicks. They were too Modest. They might easily have prevailed with him, or have had him commanded to join in their Consecration in a Church, after a Legal manner. He, who did not stick at renouncing the Pope, and swearing an Oath of Supremacy to his Prince, would not have stuck at a Legal Ordination, upon the just Command of his Prince. But to desire him to do it in a Tavern, in a Clandestine manner, without the Authority of the great Seal, before their Election was confirmed, wasto desire him, out of Courtesy, to run into a *Præmunire*, that is, to forfeit his Bishoprick of Landaff, his Estate, and his Liberty. Is it become a more notorious Scandal to Catholicks, to Ordain in a Church, than in a Tavern, in the Judgment of these Fathers? There may be Scandal taken at the former, but notorious Scandal is given by the latter.

Here Bishop Bonner steppeth upon the Stage, and had well near prevented the whole Pageant, by sending his Chaplain to the Bishop of Landaff, to forbid him, under Pain of Excommunication, to exercise any such Power of giving Orders in his Diocese, wherewith the old Man being terrified, and otherwise moved in Conscience, refused to proceed. Bishop

Acworth cont.
monar. Sander.
l. 6. p. 195.

Bonner was always very fierce, which way soever he went : If *Acworth* say true, he escaped once very narrowly in Rome, either burning or boiling in scalding Lead, for being so violent before the Assembly of Cardinals, against the Pope, on the Behalf of Henry the Eighth, if he had not secured himself by flight. Afterwards he made such Bonfires of Protestants, and rendered himself so odious, that his Prison was his only Safeguard from being torn in Pieces by the People. But that was, *dum stetit Humi & ingens Gloria Teucrorum*, whilst he had his Prince to be his Second. Now he was deprived, and had no more to do with the Bishoprick of London, than with the Bishoprick of Constantinople, he had the habitual Power of Keys, but he had no Flock to exercise it upon. If he had continued Bishop of London still, what hath the Bishop of London to do with the Bishop of Landaff? Par

in

in parem non habet potestatem. Thirdly, Bow Church, which is near the *Nagg's-Head*, wherein the Ecclesiastical part of this Story, so far as it hath any Truth in it, was really acted, (that is, the Confirmation of Archbishop Parker's Election) though it be in the City of London, as many Churches more, is not in the Diocess of London, but a Peculiar under the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Lastly, the Fathers say, that when Parker and the rest saw that he had refused, they reviled the poor old Man, calling him doating Fool, and some of them saying, This old Fool thinketh that we cannot be Bishops, unless we be greased. The contrary is evident by the Records of the Confirmation, that the Arch-bishop Parker was not present in Person: So this whole Narration is composed of Untruths, and Mistakes, and Incongruities, and Contradictions. But that which discovereth the Falsity of it apparently to all the World, is this, that the Bishop of Landaff lived and died a Protestant Bishop, in the Reign of King Edward, for proof whereof I produce two of their own Authors.

The one is Sanders, But the Bishops, who had been created out of the Church in those most wicked times, who had now repented from their Hearts of their Schism, being not contented with this common Dispensation and Confirmation, did each of them particularly crave Pardon of their former grievous Fault, from the See Apostolick, and Confirmation in their Bishopricks, excepting the Bishop of Landaff, who omitting it, rather out of Negligence than Malice, did only relapse into Schism in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, as we interpret it, by the just Judgment of God. He acknowledgeth, that he became a Protestant again, that is in their Language, relapsed into Schism. The other is cited by Doctor Harding, We had only one Fool among us, (we see whose Livery the Fool was,) who now, I know not by what Inticements, is become yours, being unworthy the Name of a Lord and a Bishop, whose Learning is very little, and his Credit by this Action much lost. Thus writeth Dr. Harding of the Bishop of Landaff, about the fifth Year of Queen Elizabeth,

Sand. de
Schism. l. 2.
p. 350.

Confus. Apol.
parte 6. c. 2.

berh, at which time he was living, and continued Protestant Bishop of *Landaff*.

A Second Objection against the Truth of that which hath been said of the competent Number of our Protestant Bishops to make a Canonical Ordination, is an Exception against all the Seven Bishops named in the Letters Patents, that they were no true Bishops, because all of them were Ordained in a Time of *Schism*, and two of them in King *Edward's* time, according to a new Form of Ordination, and consequently they could not Ordain. That Ordination which was instituted by *Edward the Sixth*, was judged invalid by the *Catholicks*, and declared so by publick Judgment in *Queen Mary's* Reign, in so much as *Leases made* *Brookes* Novel, by King *Edward's* Bishops, though confirmed by *Cases* *placit.* 493. *Dean and Chapter*, were not esteemed available, because they were not. (*saieth the Sentence*) Consecrated, nor Bishops.

To the First part of this Objection, That our Consecrators were ordained themselves by *Schismatics* or in a Time of *Schism*, I answer three Ways. First, this Argument is a meer begging of the Question. The Case in brief is this. If those Branches of Papal Power which we cast out of *England* by our Laws at the Reformation, were plain Usurpations, then our Reformation is but a Re-infranchisement of our selves, and the *Schism* lyeth at their Door, then they may question the Validity of their own Ordination upon this ground, not ours: But we are ready to maintain to all the World that all those Branches of Papal Power, which we cast out by our Laws at the Reformation, were gross Usurpations, First introduced into *England* above eleven hundred Years after Christ. So this part of the Objection concerneth them, not us.

Secondly, these Fathers know well enough, and cannot but acknowledge, that, according to the Principles of the Catholick Church and their own Practice, the Ordination not only of *Schismatics*, but of *Hereticks*, if it have no Essential Defect, is valid, and the Persons so Ordained ought not to be Re-ordained, but only Reconciled. Many Orthodox Christians had their Holy Orders from heretical *Arians*. If *Cranmer*, and *Latimer*, and *Barlow*, and

Hodgkins

Hodgkins, were no true Bishops, because they were Ordained in a time of Schism; then *Gardiner*, and *Bonner*, and *Tunstal*, and *Thurleby*, &c. were no true Bishops, for they were Ordain'd in a time of Schism likewise; then Cardinal *Pole*, and Bishop *Watson*, and *Christopherson*, and all the rest of their Bishops, were no true Bishops who were Ordain'd by these. So to put out one of our Eyes (like the envious Man in the Fable) they would put out both their own.

Thirdly, I answer, that it was not we who made a Discrimination between our Bishops and their Bishops, as to the Point of Ordination, but the *Marian* Bishops themselves, who made a mutual Compact, *one and all*, that none of them should impose hands upon any new elected Bishops; thinking vainly, there could no other Consecrators have been found out, and that by this means they should both preserve their Bishopricks, and bring the Queen to their bent: But they found themselves miserably deceived. Many Bishops who had been chased out of their Bishopricks in Queen *Mary's* Days, did now return from Exile, and supplied the Place of Consecrators. Then *conjuratiōis eos penituit*, *The Bishops repented of their Conspiracy*, *Multi ad iudices recurrunt*, *Acworth cont.*
&c. many of them ran to the Judges, confessed *Sand. l. 2. p.*
their Obstinacy, and desired leave to take the Oath *179.*
of Supremacy. Thus writeth *Acworth* an Author of good Account in those Days. If this foolish Conspiracy had not been, we had had no Difference about our Consecrations.

To the Second part of this Objection, *That the Form of Ordaining used in King Edward's Days, was declared Invalid in Queen Mary's Days*, I answer. First, that we have no Reason to regard the Judgments of their Judges in Queen *Mary's* Days, more than they regard the Judgment of our Judges in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days. They who made no scruple to take away their Lives, would make no scruple to take away their Holy Orders.

Secondly, I answer, that which the *Fathers* call a *Sentence*, was no *Sentence*. The Word is *Dicitur*, *it is said*, or *it is reported*, not *decretum est*, *it is decreed*. Neither
were

were Queen *Mary's* Laws proper Rules, nor Queen *Mary's* Judges at Common Law the proper Judges, of the Validity of an Episcopal Consecration, or what are the Essentials of Ordination, according to the Institution of Christ. They have neither Rules nor Grounds for this in the Common Law.

Thirdly, I answer that the Question, in Queen *Mary's* Days, was not about the Validity or Invalidity of our Orders, but about the Legality and Illegality of them; not whether they were conformable to the Imitation of Christ, but whether they were conformable to the Laws of *England*.

The Laws of *England* can neither make a valid Ordination to be invalid, nor an invalid Ordination to be valid, because they cannot change the Institution of Christ. In sum, King *Edward's* Bishops were both validly Ordain'd according to the Institution of Christ, and legally Ordained according to the Laws of *England*. But Queen *Mary* changed the Law, that that Form of Ordaining which had been allowed in King *Edward's* Days should not be allowed in her Days. Notwithstanding Queen *Mary's* Law, they continued still true Bishops, by the Institution of Christ, but they were not for that time legal Bishops in the Eye of the Law of *England*, which is the Judges Rule. But when Queen *Elizabeth* restored King *Edward's* Law, then they were not only true valid Bishops, but legal Bishops again.

That Corollary which the Fathers add, *in so much as Leases made by King Edward's Bishops, though confirmed by the Dean and Chapter, were not esteemed available, because they were not Consecrated or Bishops*, that is, in the Eye of the English Law at that time, signifieth nothing at all. Leases concern the *Benefice* of a Bishop, not the *Office* of a Bishop. A Bishop who is legally Ordained, though he be invalidly Ordained, may make a Lease which is good in Law. And a Bishop which is validly Ordained, if he be illegally Ordained, may make a Lease which is void in Law.

Concerning Bishop *Bonner's* Conscience, that he lost his Bishoprick for his Conscience, and therefore it is not probable

probable that *he would make himself guilty of so much Sacrilege, as to declare King Edward's Form of Ordination to be invalid for the profit of new Leases; it belongeth not to me to judge of other Men's Consciences. But for Bishop Bonner's Conscience, I refer him to the Testimony of one of his Friends, Nicolas Sanders, who speaking of Bishop Gardiner, Bishop Bonner, Bishop Tunstall, and the Bishops of Worcester and Chichester, concludeth with these Words. Timide ergo restiterunt pueri Regis primatui spirituali, imò simpliciter subscripserunt, & in omnes ceteras innovationes, quæ non videbantur ipsis continere apertam hæresim, ne Episcopatus & honores perderent, vel ultrò, vel contra conscientiam coacti consenserunt. Therefore they resisted the Spiritual Primacy of the King, being but a Boy, faintly; yea they subscribed to it simply, and they consented to all the rest of the Innovations, which*

De Schismate l. 2.
p. 282 Edit Rom.

did not seem to them to contain manifest Heresy, either of their own accord, or compelled against Conscience, lest they should lose their Bishopricks and Honours. We see they had no great reason to brag of Bishop Bonner's Conscience, who sometimes had been a great Favourite of Cranmer and Cromwel. He got his Bishoprick by opposing the Pope, and lost his Bishoprick by opposing his Prince. But if Re-ordination be such a Sacrilege, many Romanists are guilty of gross Sacrilege, who re-ordain those Profelites whom they seduce from us, with the same Essentials, Matter and Form, Imposition of Hands, and these Words, Receive the holy Ghost; wherewith they had been formerly ordained by us.

Lastly I answer, (and this Answer alone is sufficient to determine this Controversy,) that King Edward's Form of Ordination was judged valid in Queen Mary's days by all Catholics, and particularly by Cardinal Pole then Apostolical Legate in England, and by the then Pope Paul the fourth, and by all the Clergy and Parliament of England. The Case was this:

In the A^d for repealing all Statutes made against the See of Rome, in the first and second Years of Philip and Mary, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament

G

assembled

assembled, representing the whole Body of the Realm of England, presented their common Request to the King and Queen, that they would be a means to the Legate to obtain some Settlements by Authority of the Pope's Holiness, for Peace sake, in some Articles, whereof this is one, *That Institutions of Benefices and other Promotions Ecclesiastical, and Dispensations, made according to the Form of the Act of Parliament might be confirmed.* Institutions could not be confirmed, except Ordinations were confirmed. For the greatest part of the English Clergy had received both their Benefices and their holy Orders, after the casting of the Pope's usurped Authority out of England. And both Benefices and holy Orders are comprehended under the Name of Ecclesiastical Promotions. This will appear much more clearly, by the very Words of the Cardinal's Dispensation; *Ac omnes ecclesiasticas seculares seu quorumvis ordinum regulares personas, quæ aliquas impetrationes, dispensationes, concessiones, gratias & indulta, tam ordines quam beneficia Ecclesiastica, seu alias spirituales materias, prætenſa autoritate ſuprematatis Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, licet nulliter & de factò obtenuerint, & ad cor verſa Eccleſia unitati reſtituta fuerint, in ſuis Ordinibus & Beneficiis, per noſſiſos ſeu à nobis ad id deputatos miſericorditer recipiemus, prout jam multæ receptæ fuerunt, ſecumque ſuper his opportune in domino diſpenſabimus:* And we will graciously receive (or entertain) by our ſelves, or

Cardinal Pole's
Dispensation.

by others deputed by us to that purpose, (as many have already been received) in their Orders and in their Benefices, all Ecclesiastical Persons as well Secular as Regular, of whatsoever Orders, which have obtained any Suits, Dispensations, Grants, Graces, and Indulgences, as well in their Ecclesiastical Orders, as Benefices and other spiritual Matters, by the pretended Authority of the Supremacy of the Church of England, though ineffectually and only de facto, so they be penitent, and be returned to the Unity of the Church. And we will in due season dispense with them in the Lord for these things.

Here we see evidently, that upon the request of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, being the

the representative Body of the Church and Kingdom of England, by the Intercession of the King and Queen, the Pope's Legate did receive all Persons, which had been Ordained or Beneficed, either in the time of King Henry or King Edward, in their respective Orders and Benefices, which they were actually possessed of, at the time of the making of this Dispensation or Confirmation, without any Exception or Condition, but onely this, That they were returned to the Unity of the *Catholick Church*. Neither was there ever any one of them, who were then returned, either deprived of their Benefices, or compelled to be reordained. From whence I argue thus, Either King Henry the eighth's Bishops and Priests, and likewise the Bishops and Priests Ordained in King Edward the sixth's time, had all the Essentials of Episcopal and Priestly Ordination, which were required by the Institution of Christ; and then they ought not to be reordained; Then (in the judgment of these Fathers themselves) it is grievous Sacrilege to reordain them: Or they wanted some Essential of their respective Ordinations, which was required by the Institution of Christ; and then it was not in the power of all the Popes and Legates, that ever were in the World, to confirm their respective Orders, or dispense with them to execute their Functions in the Church. But the Legate did dispense with them to hold their Orders, and exercise their several Functions in the Church, and the Pope did confirm that Dispensation. This doth clearly destroy all the pretensions of the *Romanists* against the Validity of our Orders.

It may perhaps be objected, That the dispensative Word is *recipiemus*, we will receive, not we do receive. I answer, the Case is all one; If it were unlawful to receive them in the present, it was as unlawful to receive them in the future. All that was done after, was to take a particular Absolution or Confirmation from the Pope or his Legate, which many of the Principal Clergy did, but not all; No not all the Bishops; Not the Bishop of Landaff, as Sanders witnesseth, Yet he enjoyed his Bishoprick;

rick ; So did all the rest of the Clergy, who never had any particular Confirmation. It is
De Schism. l. 2. p. 305. not material at all, whether they were confirmed by a general or by a special Dispensation, so they were confirmed or dispensed with at all, to hold all their Benefices, and to exercise their respective Functions in the Church, which no man can deny.

Secondly, It may be objected, That it is said in the Dispensation, *licet nulliter & de facto obtenuerint*, *Although they had obtained their Benefices and Promotions ineffectually and only in fact*, without Right : Which doth intimate that their Orders were void and null, before they had obtained this Dispensation. I answer, That he stiled them void and null, not absolutely but respectively, *quoad exercitium*, because by the Roman Law they might not be lawfully exercised without a Dispensation ; but not *quoad Characterem*, as to the Character. If they had wanted any thing necessary to the imprinting of the Character, or any thing essential by the institution of Christ, the Pope's Dispensation and Confirmation had been but like a Seal put to a blank piece of paper. And so the Cardinal's Dispensation in general, and particularly for Benefices and Ecclesiastical Promotions, Dispensations, and Graces given by such Order as the Laws of the Realm allowed and prescribed, in King Henry's time and King Edward's time, was then and there ratified by Act of Parliament.

Lastly, That this Dispensation was afterwards confirmed by the Pope, I prove by the confession of *Sanders* himself, though a malicious Enemy. *He* (that is Cardinal Pole, in a publick Instrument set forth in the Name and by the Authority of the Pope) *Confirmed all Bishops which*

De Schism. l. 2. p. 350. *had been made in the former Schism, so they were Catholick in their judgment of Religion, and the six new Bishopricks which King Henry had erected in the time of the Schism. And this Writing being affixed to the Statute, was published with the rest of the Decrees of that Parliament, and their minds were pacified. All*
which

which things were established and confirmed afterwards, by the Letters of Pope Paul the Fourth.

We have seen, that there were a competent Number of *Protestant* Bishops beyond Exception to make a Consecration: And so the Necessity, which is their only *Basis* or Foundation of the *Nag's-head* Consecration, being quite taken away, this prodigious Fable having nothing else to support the Incredibilities and Inconsistencies of it, doth melt away of it self like Winter Ice.

The *Fifth Reason* is drawn from that well known Principle in Rhetorick, *Cui bono?* or *A Fifth Reason.* what Advantage could such a Consecration, as the *Nag's-head* Consecration is pretended to have been, bring to the Consecrators, or the Persons consecrated. God and Nature never made any thing in vain. The Hair of the Head, the Nails upon the Fingers ends, do serve both for Ornament and Muniment. The Leaves defend the Blossoms, the Blossoms produce the Fruit, which is Nature's end. In Sensitives, the Spider doth not weave her Webs, nor the silly Bee make her Cells in vain. But especially intellectual Creatures have always some End of their Actions. Now consider, what good such a mock Consecration could do the Persons so consecrated? Could it help them to the possession of their Bishopricks by the Law of *England*? Nothing less. There is such a concatenation of our *English* Customs and Records, that the Counterfeiting of any one can do no good, except they could counterfeit them all, which is impossible.

When any Bishop's See becommeth void, there issueth a Writ out of the Exchequer to seize the Temporalities into the King's hand, as being the ancient and well known Patron of the *English* Church; leaving the Spiritualities to the Archbishop or to the Dean and Chapter, according to the Custom of the place. Next the King granteth his *Congé d'Eslire* or his Licence to chuse a Bishop, to the Dean and Chapter; upon the receipt of this Licence, the Dean and Chapter, within a certain Number of days, chuse a Bishop, and certifie their Election to the King, under the common Seal of the Chapter.

Upon the Return of this Certificate, the King granteth out a Commission under the Great Seal of *England* to the Archbishop, or in the vacancy of the Archbishoprick, to so many Bishops, to examine the Election; and, if they find it fairly made, to confirm it; and after Confirmation, to proceed to the Consecration of the Person elected, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of *England*. This Commission or Mandate must pass both through the Signet Office and Chancery, and be attested by the Clerks of both those Offices, and Signed by the Lord Chancellor and Lord Privy-Seal, and be Inrolled. So as it is morally impossible there should be any Forgery in it.

Upon the Receipt of this Mandate, the Bishops, who are authorized by the King, do meet first at *Bow Church* in *London*, where, with the assistance of the Chief Ecclesiastical Judges of the Realm, the Dean of the Arches, the Judges of the Prerogative and Audience, with their Registers to Actuate what is done, they do Solemnly, in Form of Law, confirm the Election. Which being done, and it being late before it be done, the Commissioners and Judges were and are sometimes invited to the *Nag's-head* to a Dinner, as being very near *Bow Church*, and in those days the only Place of Note. This Meeting led *Mr. Neal* (a Man altogether unacquainted with such Forms) into this Fools Paradise; first to suspect, and upon suspicion to conclude, that they were about an Ordination there; and lastly, to broach his brain-sick Conceits in corners; and finding them to be greedily swallowed by such as wished them true, to assert his own drowsy Suspicion for a real Truth. But the mischief is, that *Dr. Parker*, who was to be consecrated, was not present in Person, but by his Proxie.

After the Confirmation is done, commonly about three or four days, (but as it happened in Archbishop *Parker's* Case nine days) the Commissioners proceed to the Consecration; for the most part, out of their respect to the Archbishop, in the Chappel at *Lambeth*, with Sermon, Sacrament, and all Solemnity requisite, according to the
the

the Form prescribed by the Church of *England*; in the presence of publick Notaries or sworn Officers, who reduce every thing that is done, with all the Circumstances, into Acts, and enter them into the Register of the See of *Canterbury*. Where they are carefully kept by the principal Officer in a publick Office, as Records, where every one who desireth may view them from time to time, and have a Copy of them if he please. And it is to be noted, that at any Consecration, especially of an Archbishop, great Numbers of principal Courtiers and Citizens are present; so as it is no more possible to counterfeit such a Consecration, than to walk invisible upon the Exchange at Noon-day.

After the Consecration is done, the Person consecrated is not presently admitted to his Bishoprick. First the Archbishop maketh his Certificate of the Consecration, with all the Circumstances of it, under his Arch-Episcopal Seal: Thereupon the King taketh the New Bishop's Oath of Fealty, and commands that he be put into the Actual Possession of his Bishoprick: Then he is Inthroned, and at his Inthronization his Ordination is publicly read: Then he enjoyeth his Spiritualities: Then issueth a Writ out of the Exchequer to the Sheriff, to restore him to the Temporalities of his Bishoprick. This Custom is so ancient, so certain, so general, that no *English-man* can speak against it.

Here we see evidently how all things do pursue one another, and what a necessary and essential Connexion there is between them. So as the stealing of an Election, or the stealing of a Consecration, can get no Man a Bishoprick, as Mr. *Neal* dreamed. He that would advantage himself that way, must falsify all the Records, both Ecclesiastical and Civil. He must falsify the Records of Chancery, of the Signet Office, of the Exchequer, of the Registries, of the Bishop, and of the Dean and Chapter. He must counterfeit the Hands and Seals of the King, of the Archbishop, of the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Privy Seal, of the Clerks and publick Notaries, which is not imaginable. If Mr. *Neal*, who first devised

this drowsy dream (or somebody for him) had had more experience of our *English* Laws and Customs, he would have feigned a more probable Tale, or have held his Peace for ever.

Answer me, they who are calumniated to have had their Consecration at the *Nag's-head*, did they mean to conceal it and have it kept secret? Then what good could it do them? *De non existentibus & non apparentibus eadem est ratio*: If it were concealed, it was all one as if it had never been. Or did they mean to have it published? Such an Ordination had been so far from helping them to obtain a Bishoprick, that it had rendred them uncapable of a Bishoprick for ever: And moreover subjected both the Consecraters and the Consecrated to Deprivation, and Degradation, and a Premunire or Forfeiture of their Lands, Goods and Liberties, and all that were present at it to Excommunication. *Rome* is a fit place wherein to publish such Ludibrious Fables as this; where they can perswade the People, that the *Protestants* are stupid Creatures, who have lost their Religion, their Reason, and scarcely retain their humane shapes. It is too bold an attempt, to obtrude such counterfeit Wares in *England*.

C H A P. IV.

The Sixth and Seventh Reasons, That all the Records of England are diametrically opposite to their Relation, and do establish our Relation.

Hitherto we have been taking in the Outworks: Now I come directly to assault this Castle in the Air. That which has been said already is sufficient to perswade any Man, who is not brim-ful of prejudice and partiality: The other Five Reasons which follow next, have power to compel all Men, and command their Assents.

My

My Sixth Reason is taken from the diametral Opposition which is between this fabulous Relation of the *Nag's-head* Ordination, and all the Records of *England*, both Ecclesiastical and Civil. *First* for the Time. The *Romanists* say, That this Ordination was before the ninth of *September Ann. 1559*; but it is apparent by all the Records of the Chancery, all the distinct Letters Patents or Commissions for their Respective Confirmations, and Consecrations, whereupon they were consecrated, did issue out long after; namely, Archbishop *Parker's* Letters Patents (which were the first) upon the sixth day of *December* following. Next the Commissions for *Grindall*, *Cox* and *Sands*; Then for *Bullingham*, *Jewel* and *Davis*; Then for *Bentham* and *Barkley*; and in the Year following for *Horn*, *Alley*, *Scambler* and *Pilkinton*. He that hath a mind to see the Copies of these Commissions, may find them Recorded *Verbatim* both in the Rolls of the Archbishop's Register, and in the Rolls of the Chancery. To what end were all these Letters Patents, to authorize so many Confirmations and Consecrations, if the Consecrations were done and past long before? No Man's Election can be confirmed in *England*, but by Virtue of the King's Letters Patents. Therefore the Letters Patents must preceede the Confirmation and Consecration, not follow after it three Months, or four Months, or six Months, and in some of them above a Year. *Rot. pars 14. 2. El.*

And as by the Records of the Chancery, so their Relation is proved to be a notorious Fable, by all the Ecclesiastical Records; first of their several and distinct Confirmations, which pursued their Commissions punctually; then of their several and distinct Consecrations which pursued their Confirmations punctually. He who desireth to see these, may find Authentick Records of them all, both Confirmations and Consecrations, in the Register of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*. It is not the forging of one Record that would serve the turn: Either all these Records must be forged, or the *Nag's-head* Ordination is a silly senseless Fable.

Lastly,

Lastly, after the Consecration followeth the Instalment or Inthronization, which is to be found in the Register of the Dean and Chapter: And the Restitution of the new Bishop to his Temporalties by Virtue of the King's Writ, mentioning the Confirmation and Oath of Fealty to the King, as being Temporal things. Observe how every one of these do pursue another. Archbishop *Parker's* Commission issued *December* the sixth, his Confirmation followed *December* the ninth, his Consecration *December* the seventeenth, his Inthronization forthwith, and the Restitution to his Temporalties the first of *March* ensuing, that is, at the latter end of the very next Term. But by their Relation, the Consecration was long before the Election was confirmed, which cannot be: The Letters Patents, to license the Confirmation and Consecration, came out three Months after the Consecration was done, which is incredible. As for the Confirmation, Mr. *Neal* who was their Contriver, knew not what it was. The Instalment followed three Months after the Consecration, and the Restitution to the Temporalties six Months after; which have no probability.

Thus for the Time; next for the Place. Their lying Relation saith, the Elected Bishops were consecrated at the *Nag's-head*: All the Ecclesiastical Records say they were consecrated at *Lambeth*. The King's Commission enjoineth a legal Consecration according to the Form prescribed by Law: Such a legal Consecration ours at *Lambeth* was; Such a legal Consecration theirs at the *Nag's-head* was not, neither for the Place, nor for the Rites, nor for the Essentials of Consecration. And without good assurance that the Consecration was legal, neither the Person consecrated could have been Inthroned, nor made his Oath of Fidelity to the King, nor have been restored to his Temporalties; but he was Inthroned, and did his Fealty, and was restored to his Temporalties, that is as much as to say, that his Consecration was legally performed at *Lambeth*, not illegally at the *Nag's-head*.

Thirdly, For the Consecrator. That fabulous Relation

tion feigneth that there was but one Consecrator, or at the most two: The authentick Records of the Church of *England* testifie, that there were four Consecrators. The Letters Patents require that there should be four Consecrators, and without an authentick Certificate that there were four Consecrators, the King's Writ for Re-stitution had not issued.

They feign that they imposed Hands mutually, *Scory* upon them and they upon *Scory*: But the Records witness that *Scory* was Solemnly ordained Bishop in King *Edward's* time, the thirteenth Day of *August Anno* 1551, by the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, Reg. *Cran. fol. 334.* the Bishop of *London*, and the Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*; and needed not to be reordain'd at the *Nag's-head*.

Lastly, For the Persons consecrated; some of them feign that all the elected Bishops, and all of them say that many of them, were consecrated together at one time with Archbishop *Parker*: But all the Records both Civil and Ecclesiastical do testify the contrary, that they had several Commissions, several Confirmations, several Consecrations, upon several Days, in several Months, in several Years, several Consecrators; as appeareth most evidently, not only by the Authentick Records of the See of *Canterbury*, but also by the Records of the Chancery; and particularly by the several Commissions directed expressely to Archbishop *Parker*, as a Bishop actually consecrated, for the Consecration of all the rest, the three first of which Commissions or Letters Patents bear Date the Eighteenth of *December An. 1559*, that is the very next Day after Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration; for the Confirmation and Consecration of *Grindal*, *Cox* and *Sands*, three of those elected Bishops. He that doubteth of the Truth of these Letters Patents, may find them recorded *verbatim*, both in the Archbishop's Registry, and in the Rolls. If they were confirmed and consecrated by Archbishop *Parker*, then they were not consecrated together with Archbishop *Parker*, as in that lying Relation is affirmed. And with this their subsequent Instalments and Restitutions do exactly agree.

Either

Either all the Records of *England* must be false, or this silly Fable of the *Nag's-head* is a prodigious Forgery.

Thus we have seen how the Records of *England*, Civil and Ecclesiastical, do contradict this
The seventh Reason. Tale of a Tub. My Seventh Reason sheweth how the same Records do Confirm and Establish our Relation. We say first, That the See of *Canterbury* being void by the Death of Cardinal *Pole*, (who died as some say the very same day with Queen *Mary*, others say the day following,) the Queen granted her *Conge d'eslire* to the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury* to chuse an Archbishop. This is clearly proved by the Authentick Copy of the *Conge d'eslire* it self in the Rolls. *Regina*
Rot. ps. 6. 1. Elis. dilectis sibi in Christo Decano & Capitulo
Ecclesia Metropolitana Cantuariensis, su-
lutem, &c.

Examinatur

RICHARD BROUGHTON.

Secondly, We say, That the Dean and Chapter 'having received this Licence, did chuse Dr. *Matthew Parker* for their Archbishop. This is apparent by the Queen's Commission for his Confirmation and Restitution, wherein there is this Clause: *And the said Dean and Chapter, by Virtue of our Licence, have chosen our Beloved in Christ Matthew Parker Professor of Theology, for Archbishop and Pastor to them and the aforesaid Church, as by their Letters Patents directed to us thereupon it appeareth more fully.*

Thirdly, The Queen accepting this Election, was graciously pleased to issue out two Commissions for the legal Confirmation of the said Election, and consecrating of the said Archbishop. The former Dated the ninth of September Anno 1559, Directed to six Bishops, *Cuthbert* Bishop of *Durham*, *Gilbert* Bishop of *Bath*, *David* Bishop of *Peterborough*, *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*,
William

William Barlow Bishop, and John Scory Bishop, in these Words.

Elisabeth Dei gratia Angliæ &c. Reverendis in Christo Patribus Cuthberto Episcopo Dunelmensi, Gilberto Bathoniensi Episcopo, Davidi Episcopo Burgi Sancti Petri, Anthonio Landavensi Episcopo, Willelmo Barlo Episcopo, & Johanni Rot. Pars 2. 1. Eliz. Scory Episcopo, Salutem. Cum vacante nuper Sede Archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem Domini Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi & immediati Archiepiscopi & Pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem Decani & Capituli Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis & Metropolitana Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concesserimus alium sibi eligendi in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem Sedis prædictæ. Ac iidem Decanus & Capitulum vigore & obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum Mattheum Parker Sacræ Theologiæ Professorem sibi & Ecclesiæ prædictæ elegerint in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes Sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, plenius liquet & apparet. Nos electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni Regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus. Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundem Magistrum Mattheum Parker in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis & Metropolitana, Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic ut præfertur electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, & eundem Magistrum Mattheum in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, ceteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbant officio Pastoralis, juxta formam Statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu. In cujus rei testimonium &c. Teste Regina apud Redgrave, nono die Septembris Anno Regni Elisabethæ Angliæ &c. primo.

Per breve de privato Sigillo.

Examinatur R. BROUGHTON.

Now

Now if any Man desire a Reason why this first Commission was not executed, the best Account I can give him is this, That it was directed to six Bishops, without an [*aut minus, or at the least four of you*]; so as if any one of the six were sick or absent, or refused, the rest could not proceed to Confirm, or Consecrate. And that some of them did refuse, I am very apt to believe, because three of them not long after were deprived. But the Reader may Note, *First*, That there were three *Protestant* Bishops in that first Commission. They who were such punctual Observers of the Laws of *England*, that they would not proceed to consecrate without a fourth, in the Vacancy of both the Archiepiscopal Sees, certainly would never give way to a private profane Ordination at the *Nag's-head*, by one single Bishop. And *Secondly*, That, for all their pretended Intelligence, our *English Romish* Writers are great Strangers to the true Passages of those Times, knowing nothing but what they hear at *Rome, Rhemes, or Doway*. If it were otherwise, we should have heard of this Commission sooner.

The *Second* Letters Patents which were executed, were Dated the sixth of *December* following, directed to *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*, *William Barlow* sometime Bishop of *Bath*, now Elect Bishop of *Chichester*, *John Scory* sometime Bishop of *Chichester*, now Elect Bishop of *Hereford*, *Miles Coverdale* sometime Bishop of *Exeter*, *Richard* Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*, *John* Suffragan Bishop of *Tetford*, and *John Bale* Bishop of *Ossory* in *Ireland*, in these Words.

Regina &c. Reverendis in Christo Patribus Anthonio Landavensi Episcopo, Willelmo Barlow quondam Bathoniensi Episcopo, nunc Cicestrensi Electo, Johanni Scory quondam Cicestrensi Episcopo, nunc Electo Herefordiensi, Miloni Coverdale quondam Exoniensi Episcopo, Richardo Bedfordensi, Johanni Thedfordensi, Episcopis Suffraganeis, Johanni Bale Ossoriensi Episcopo, Salutem. Cum vacante nuper Sede Archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem Domini Reginaldi

Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi & immediati Archiepiscopi & Pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem Decani & Capituli Ecclesie nostre Cathedralis & Metropolitana Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per Literas nostras Patentes licentiam concesserimus alium sibi Eligendi in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem Sedis prædictæ, Ac iidem Decanus & Capitulum vigore & obtentu Licentia nostra prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum Matthæum Parker Sacra Theologia Professorem, sibi & Ecclesie prædictæ Elegerunt in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem, prout per Literas suas patentes nobis inde directas plenius liquet & apparet. Nos electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni Regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus. Rogantes ac in fide & dilectione quibus Nobis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus vos aut minus quatuor vestrum, eundem Matthæum Parker in Archiepiscopum, & Pastorem Ecclesie Cathedralis & Metropolitana Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ sicut præfertur Electum, electionemque prædictam Confirmare, & eundem Magistrum Matthæum Parker in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem Ecclesie prædictæ consecrare, Ceteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbant officio Pastoralis, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu. Supplentes nihilominus suprema Authoritate nostra Regia, ex mero motu & certa Scientia nostris, si quid aut in his quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, Statu, facultate vestris, ad præmissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus Regni nostri, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur, aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione & rerum necessitate id postulante. In cujus Rei &c. Teste Regina apud Westmonasterium sexto die Decembris, Anno Regni Regine Elisabethæ, Angliæ &c. Secundo.

Examinatur

RI. BROUGHTON.

Before

Before I proceed further, to prevent cavils, I must acquaint the Reader, that the Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford* is mis-named *Richard* in the Rolls; by what mistake or error, after so long time, it is folly to enquire. We may conjecture how it might easily, and most probably did come to pass; but to say positively how it did come to pass; whether it was the Error of the Transcriber, or the Mistake of him who gave the Instructions, or it was no Fault at all, (he might have two Names, as many have had, and many have and own them severally) is not possible. In the Ecclesiastical Register of the Church he is always stiled by his right Name *John*, throughout all the Acts of the Confirmation and Consecration of Archbishop *Parker*. Once his Name had been written *Richard*, but it was corrected, and my Friend assureth me, that it is the only Word in that long narration which is expunged or interlined; so exact is that Record. This is certain, his right Name was *John*, as it is in the Register. To this the Records of his own Consecration, and Twenty other Records do bear Witness.

But as to the Validity of the Act or Ordination, it is not material whether his Name was *John* or *Richard*, or both, or neither. So he was truly ordained himself, and did truly concur in ordaining, it is no matter how he is stiled in the Commission, or in the Register. Regal Commissions are no Essentials of Ordination. Notarial Acts are no Essentials of Ordination. The mis-naming of the Baptizer in a Parish-Register doth not make void the Baptism. When Popes do consecrate themselves, (as they do sometimes) they do it by the Names of *Paul*, or *Alexander*, or *Urbanus*, or *Innocentius*; yet these are not the Names which were imposed upon them at their Baptisms, or at their Confirmations, but such Names as themselves have been pleased to assume. But to come to more serious matter.

There are two Differences between these two Commissions. The first is an [*aut minus, or at the least four of you,*] which Clause is prudently inserted into all Commissions,

Commissions, where many Commissioners are named; lest Sickness, or Absence, or Neglect of any one or more might hinder the Work. The Question is, why they are limited to *Four*, when the Canons of the Catholick Church require but *Three*? The Answer is obvious, Because the Statutes of *England* do require *Four*, in case one of the Consecrators be not an Archbishop, or deputed by one. *Three* had been enough to make a valid Ordination, yea to make a Canonical Ordination; and the Queen might have dispensed with her own Laws: but she would have the Bishops to be Ordained both according to the Canons of the Catholick Church, and the known Laws of *England*.

The second Difference between the two Commissions is this, That there is a *Suppletor* in the latter Commission, which is not in the former, [*Supplying, by our Sovereign Authority, all Defects, either in the Execution, or in the Executors of this Commission, or any of them.*] The Court of *Rome*, in such like Instruments, have ordinarily such dispensative Clauses, for more abundant Caution, whether there be need of them or not, to *relax all Sentences, Censures, and Penalties inflicted, either by the Law or by the Judge.*

But still the Question is, To what End was this Clause inserted? I Answer, It is End enough, if it serve (as the Court of *Rome* useth it) for a certain Salvo to help any latent Impediment, though there be none. A superfluous Clause doth not vitiate a Writing. Some think it might have reference to Bishop Coverdale's *Syde woollen Gown*, which he used at the Consecration, *toga lanea talari utebatur*. That was Uncanonical indeed, and needed a Dispensation for him that used it, not for him that was Consecrated. But this was so slender a Defect, and so far from the Heart or Essence of Ordination; especially where the Three other Consecrators, (which is the Canonical Number) were formally and regularly Habited, that it was not worth an Intimation under the great Sale of *England*. This *Miles Coverdale* had been both validly and legally Ordained Bishop, and had as

D

much

much Power to Ordain as the Bishop of Rome himself. If he had been *Roman Catholick* in his judgment, he had been declared, by Cardinal *Pole*, as good a Bishop, as either *Bonner*, or *Thirleby*, or any of the rest.

Others think, this Clause might have relation to the present Condition of Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Scorey*, who were not yet introned into their New Bishopricks. It might be so ; but if it was, it was a great mistake in the Lawyers who drew up the Commission. The Office and Benefice of a Bishop are two distinct things ; Ordination is an Act of the Key of Order, and a Bishop uninthroned may Ordain as well as a Bishop introned. The Ordination of Suffragan Bishops, who had no peculiar Bishopricks, was always admitted and reputed as good in the Catholick Church, (if the Suffragans had Episcopal Ordination,) as the Ordination of the greatest Bishops in the World.

But since this Clause doth extend it self both to the Consecration and Consecrators ; I am confident that the only ground of it was, that the same Exception, or rather Cavil which Bishop *Bonner* did afterwards make against the Legality of Bishop *Horne's* Consecration ; which is all that either *Stapleton*, or any of our Adversaries, had to pretend against the Legality of the Ordination of our first Protestant Bishops ; that *they were not Ordained according to the Prescript of our very Statutes*.

I have set down this Case formerly, in my Replication to the Bishop of *Calcedon*. But, to avoid wrangling, I will put it down in the very Words of the Statute. King *Edward the Sixth*, in his time, by Authority of Parliament, caused the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England, to be made and set forth, not only for one Uniform Order of Service, Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments to be used within this Realm, but also did add and put to the said Book a very Godly Order, Manner and Form, how Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons and Ministers, should from time to time be Consecrated, Made, and Ordered, within this Realm. Afterwards it followeth, that in the time of
Queen

Queen Mary, the several Acts and Statutes made in the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth Years of King Edward, for the authorising and allowing of the said Book of Common-Prayer and other the Premisses, were Repealed. Lastly, The Statute addeth, That by an Act made in the first Year of Queen Elizabeth, Entituled, An Act for the Uniformity of Common-Prayer and Service in the Church, and Administration of Sacraments, the said Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other the said Orders, Rites and Ceremonies, before mentioned, and all things therein contained, is fully Established and Authorized to be used in all places within the Realm.

This is the very Case related by the Parliament. Now the Exception of Bishop Bonner, and Stapleton, and the rest, was this. *The Book of Ordination* was expressly Established, by the name of *Edward Sixth* ; and that Act was expressly Repealed by *Queen Mary* : But *the Book of Ordination* was not expressly restored by *Queen Elizabeth*, but only in general terms, under the Name and notion of *the Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Orders, Rites and Ceremonies*. Therefore they who were Ordained according to the said Form of Ordination, in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* time, were not Legally Ordained. And those Bishops which had been Ordained according to that Form in *King Edward's* time, though they were Legally Ordained then, yet they were not Legal Bishops now, because *Queen Mary's* Statute was still in Force, and was not yet Repealed.

Is this all ? Take Courage Reader, here is nothing that toucheth the Validity of our Ordination, but only the Legality of it, which is easily satisfied. *First*, I answer, That *Queen Mary's* Statute was Repealed sufficiently, even as to the Book of Ordination ; as appeareth by the very Words of the Statute which Repealed it. *And that the said Book, with the Order of Service and of the Administration of Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies, shall be, after the Feast of St. John Baptist next, in full Force and Effect, any thing in Queen Mary's Statute of Repeal*

to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. That the Book of Ordination was a part of this Book, and printed in this Book in King Edward's days, besides the express Testimony of the Statute in the eighth of Queen Elizabeth, we have the Authority of the Canons of the Church of England, which call it singularly *the Book of Common-Prayer, and of Ordering Bishops, Priests and Deacons*. It is our Form of Prayer upon that occasion, as much as our Form of Baptizing, or Administring the Holy Eucharist, or our Form of Confirming, or Marrying, or Visiting the Sick.

Canon 36. Secondly, It is also a part of our Form of Administration of the Sacraments. We deny not Ordination to be a Sacrament, though it be not one of those two Sacraments, which are generally necessary to Salvation.

Thirdly, Although it were supposed that Ordination were no Sacrament, nor the Book of Ordination a part of the Book of Common-Prayer; yet no Man can deny that it is a part of our Ecclesiastical Rites and Ceremonies, and under that Notion sufficiently authorized.

Ejus est legem interpretari cujus est condere. They who have Legislative Power to make a Law, have Legislative Power to expound a Law. Queen Elizabeth and her Parliament made the Law, Queen Elizabeth and her Parliament expounded the Law, by the same Authority that made it; declaring that, under the Book of Common-Prayer, the Form of Ordination was comprehended, and ought to be understood. And so ended the grand Cavil of Bishop Bonner, and Dr. Stapleton, and the rest, of the Illegality of our Ordination; shewing nothing but this, how apt a drowning Cause is to catch hold of every Reed.

That the *Supplentes*, or this dispensative Clause had Relation to this Cavil, (which as it did break out afterwards into an open Controversy, so it was then whifpered in corners,) is very evident by one Clause in the Statute; that *For the avoiding all Questions and Ambiguities that might be objected against the Lawful Confirmations, In-vesting, and Consecrating of any Archbishops, Bishops, &c.*

the Queen, in her Letters Patents, had not only used such Words as had been accustomed to be used by King Henry and King Edward, but also diverse other general Words, whereby her Highness, by her Supreme Power and Authority, hath dispensed with all Causes and Doubts of any Imperfection or Disability that could be objected. The End of this Clause and that Statute was the same; And this was the only Question or Ambiguity that was moved.

Yet, although the Case was so evident, and was so judged by the Parliament, that the Form of Consecration was comprehended under the Name and Notion of the Book of Common-Prayer, &c. yet, in the Indictment against Bishop Bonner, I do commend the Discretion of our Judges, and much more the Moderation of the Parliament. Criminal Laws should be written with a Beam of the Sun, without all Ambiguity.

Lastly, Before I leave this *third* Consideration, I desire the Reader to observe three things with me;

First, That this Dispensative Clause neither hath, nor can be construed to have any Reference to any Consecration that was already past, or that was acted by Bishop Scory alone, as that silly Consecration at the *Naggs-head* is supposed to have been.

Secondly, That this Dispensative Clause doth not extend at all to the Institution of Christ, or any Essential of Ordination, nor to the Canons of the Universal Church; but only to the Statutes and Ecclesiastical Laws of England. *Si quid desit aut deerit eorum quæ per Statuta hujus Regni nostri, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas requiruntur.*

Thirdly, That the Commissioners, authorized by these Letters Patents to Confirm and Consecrate Archbishop Parker, did make use of this *Supplentes* or Dispensative Power, in the Confirmation of the Election, which is a Political Act (as by the Words of the Confirmation in the next Paragraph shall appear;) but not in the Consecration, which is a purely Spiritual Act, and belongeth meerly to the Key of Order.

Fourthly, We say, that by Virtue of these Letters Patents of *December* the sixth, four of the Commissioners therein named did meet in *Bow Church*, upon the ninth day of the same Month; and then and there, with the Advice of the chief Ecclesiastical Lawyers of the Kingdom, the Dean of the Arches, the Judges of the Prerogative and Audience, did solemnly Confirm the Election. This is proved by the Record of the Confirmation, or definitive Sentence it self, in these words.

In Dei nomine, Amen. Nos Willelmus quondam Bathoniensis & Wellensis Episcopus nunc Ciceſtrenſis Electus, Johannes Scory quondam Ciceſtrenſis Episcopus nunc Electus Herefordensis, Milo Coverdale quondam Exoniensis Episcopus, & Johannes Bedford Episcopus Suffraganeus, Mediantibus literis Commissionariis Illustrissimæ Reginae fidei Defensatrici, &c. Commissionarii, cum hac clausula, videlicet [Una cum Johanne Thetfordensi Suffraganeo & Johanne Bale Ossoriensi Episcopo.] Et etiam cum hac clausula [Quatenus vos aut ad minus quatuor vestrum,] Nec non & hac adjectione [Supplentes nihilominus, &c.] specialiter & legitime Deputati, &c. Idcirco nos Commissionarii Regii antedicti, de & cum assensu Jurisperitorum, cum quibus in hac parte communicavimus, prædictam Electionem Supremæ Autoritate dictæ Dominæ nostræ Reginae nobis in hac parte Commissa, Confirmamus. Supplentes ex Suprema Autoritate Regia, ex mero Principis motu & certa Scientia nobis delegata, quicquid in hac electione fuerit defectum. Tum in his quæ juxta mandatum nobis creditum a nobis factum & processum est, aut in nobis aut aliquo nostrum, conditione, Statu, facultate ad hæc perficienda deest aut decrit. Tum etiam eorum quæ per statuta hujus Regni Angliæ, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requisita sunt aut necessaria, prout temporis ratio & rerum præsentium necessitas id postulant, per hanc nostram sententiam definitivam, sive hoc nostrum finale decretum, &c.

I cite this the more largely, that our Adversaries may see what Use was made of the Dispensation, which they cavil so much against: But in the Consecration, which is an Act of the Key of Order, they made no use at all of it. This is likewise clearly proved by the Queen's Mandat e

Mandate for the Restitution of Archbishop Parker to his Temporalties, wherein there is this Clause. [*Cui quidem electioni & personæ sic Electæ Regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus & favorem, ipsiusque fidelitatem nobis debitam pro dicto Archiepiscopatu recepimus.*]

Rot. pars 14.
2 Elizabeth.

Fifthly, We say, that eight days after the Confirmation, that is to say the 17. of December, Anno 1559, the same Commissioners did proceed to the Consecration of Archbishop Parker, in the Archiepiscopal Chapel at Lambeth, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of England, with solemn Prayers and Sermon, and the Holy Eucharist; at which great Numbers of grave Persons communicated with him at that time, [*frequens gravissimorum hominum cætus.*] This is proved evidently by the authentick Records of the Consecration, as they are still and always have been to be seen, in the publick Registry of the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury.

Registrum Reverendissimi in Christo Patris & Domini, Domini Matthæi Parker, &c. Principio Sacellum tapetibus ad Orientem adornabatur, solum vero panno rubro insternebatur, &c. And so first setting down both how the Chapel was adorned for the Consecration, and what Habits and Garments, as well the Consecrators, as the Person who was to be Consecrated, did wear, both at the Prayers and Sermon, as likewise at the Holy Sacrament and Consecration, it proceedeth to the Consecration itself, *Finis tandem Evangelio, Herefordensis Electus, Bedfordensis Suffraganeus, & Milo Coverdale, Archiepiscopum coram Cicerensium Electo apud mensam in Cathedra sedente his verbis adduxerunt, Reverende in Deo Pater, hunc virum pium pariter atque doctum tibi offerimus atque præsentamus, ut Archiepiscopus consecratur. Postquam hæc dixissent, proferebatur illico regium Diploma sive Mandatum pro Consecratione Archiepiscopi, quo per Dominum Doctorem Yale legum Doctorem perlecto, Sacramentum de Regio primatu sive suprema ejus autoritate tuenda, juxta statuta primo anno Regni Sereñissimæ Reginæ nostræ Elizabethæ edita & promulgata, ab eodem Archiepiscopo exigebatur. Quod cum ille solemniter tactis corporaliter sacris Evangeliiis, conceptis verbis præ-*

Reg. Park.
1. 1. f. 2.

stitisset, Ciceſtrenſis Electus populum ad orationem hortatus ad Letanias decantandas Choro respondente ſe accinxit. Quibus finitis, poſt quaſtiones aliquot Archiepiſcopo per Ciceſtrenſem Electum propoſitas, & poſt orationes & ſuffragia quædam juxta formam libri authoritate Parlamenti cediti apud Deum habita, Ciceſtrenſis, Herefordenſis, Suffraganeus Bedfordenſis, & Milo Coverdallus, manibus Archiepiſcopo impoſitis, dixerunt, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, & excitare memineris gratiam Dei quæ in te eſt per manuum impoſitionem. Dedit enim nobis Deus Spiritum non Timoris, ſed Potestatis, Charitatis, & Sobrietatis, &c.

This is ſo evident, that our Adverſaries have nothing to ſay, but to cry the Records are forged. Forgery of Records is a grievous Crime, and ought to be manifeſtly proved, or the Accuſer to ſuffer for his Calumny. Let them tell us who forged them, and when and where they were forged. But they knew nothing of it. Did any of the ſucceeding Protonotaries complain that they were forged? or ſo much as an Under-Clerk of the Office, or any Man that had once occaſion to view them, and afterwards found ſome Change in them?

No ſuch thing. Examine all the Officers, and Notaries, and Clerks living, whether ever they obſerved any Change in them during their Remembrance; and they will all Answer, No. And ſo would all their Predeceſſors, ſince Archbiſhop Parker's time, have answered, if they had been put to their Oaths. Who are they then that accuſe them of Forgery? They are the Adverſaries of the Church of England, who never read one Word of them, nor know much what belongeth to ſuch Records: But they wiſh if they be not forged, that they were forged. What would you have Men do? If they could answer them otherwiſe, they would; But they cannot, and therefore they cry them down as Forged.

It is poſſible to forge private Acts done in a corner: But to forge a Conſecration done publickly at Lambeth, in Queen Elizabeth's time, and to forge it ſo early as
this

this was Publish'd to the World, is incredible. Surely these Fathers do not know the Customs of the Church, that all things which are done at Publick Consecrations, are presently drawn into Acts by Principal Notaries, and kept in Publick Registries, and the Custody of them committed to Sworn Officers. And this Practice was not begun in *England* upon this occasion, but hath been observed throughout both Provinces for time immemorial. I should not waste one Penful of Ink upon an *English-Man*, who either doth know, or ought to know, what Credit the Law of *England* doth give to these Records: But for the Satisfaction of Strangers, who are misled by such bold Calumnies, I will take leave for once to prove that, which, like the common Principles of Arts, ought to be taken for granted, and *De quo nefas est dubitare*. Let us try whether they can say more for the *Vatican* Records, than we can for these.

For the present, I produce six Grounds, to convince all those who gainsay them. The *first* is, That Value and Respect which the *Laws* of the Kingdom do give them, that is, to allow them to be authentick Proofs; Especially in Cases of this Nature, concerning Spiritual Acts belonging to the Key of Order. If a Clerk have lost his Letters of Orders, a Certificate out of this Registry, under the Seal of the Archbishop, or the Hand of the Protonotary, is an authentick Proof. Shall two or three Adversaries, who are Strangers, and know little of our Affairs, altogether unacquainted with our Laws and Records, dare, without any ground, to defame that for forged, which the Laws of the Kingdom do allow for Authentick? Either these Records are Authentick, or *Christendom* never had an Authentick Ecclesiastical Record. The very Acts of our Synods or Convocations are not more undoubted than these are.

My *Second* Proof is taken from the Credit of the Publick Notaries, who did testify this individual Consecration, and draw it up into Acts. The Testimony of two Publick Notaries, for matter of Fact, maketh full Proof
over

over all *Europe* : but here at least four Publick Notaries were present at this Consecration, and testified the Truth of these Acts ; Whereof two of them were the Principal Publick Notaries in *England*, that is, *Anthony Huse*, Protonotary of the See of *Canterbury*, and *Thomas Argall*, Register of the Prerogative Court, assisted in actuating this Consecration, by *Thomas Willet* and *John Jusent*, Publick Notaries. Who can make doubt of a matter of Fact so well attested ?

But it is further Observable, that these four Publick Notaries were the same who did draw Cardinal *Pole's* Consecration into Acts, and attested them. Either let these Fathers deny that Cardinal *Pole* was Consecrated, or let them grant that Archbishop *Parker* was Consecrated. *Aut utramque negate, aut utramque concedite.* There are the same Proofs for the one as for the other. There needeth no more to be done to satisfie any Man that hath Eyes in his Head, but to compare the one Register with the other.

We owe a third Ground to the Queen's extraordinary Care, who was so solicitous, lest some Circumstance in the Political part might be defective in some *punctilio* of Law, by reason of the frequent Change of the Statutes in the Reigns of her Father, Brother, Sister, and Her self, that she caused the Letters Patents to be carefully perused by six of our most eminent Lawyers, who all with one unanimous Consent did certifie, That the Commission was good in Law, and that the Consecrators might proceed Legally to Consecration upon it ; which Certificate, subscribed with their own Hands, is preserved in the Records. So if these Records be forged, not only the Acts of the Principal Notaries of *England*, but also the Hands of the Principal Lawyers of *England* must be forged for company, which is incredible.

The fourth Ground is irrefragable, taken from the Testimony and Authority of the Parliament of *England*, in the eighth year of Queen *Elizabeth*, that was about six years after this Consecration was acted ; which speaking of the great Care was taken in and about the Elections,

Elections, Confirmations, and Consecrations of Archbishop Parker, and the rest of those first Bishops in Queen Elizabeth's time, for Proof thereof, referreth us to these very Records, [*As the Records of her Majesties said Father's and Brother's time, and also her own time, will more plainly testify and declare.*] Doth the Parliament refer Subjects to to Records which are forged? You see the contrary, that it mentioneth them as authentick, undoubted, undeniable Proofs of what was really done.

To this unanswerable Reason, these Fathers pretend to give two Answers: But they are such as are able to satisfy any Man, that no Answer is to be expected. The first Answer is in their printed Book, pag. 16, that *the Word Records is but a general Term.* As if Truth ought not to be regarded in Generals, as well as in Particulars. Yet the Terms which are added to *Records*, that is, [*of her Father's time, her Brother's time, and her time,*] are no general but restraining Terms.

They add, that *It is a Word of Course, which Men do rather suppose than examine, when they mention things that have been practised in former Times.* What Latitude these Fathers may allow their Consents, in Case-Theology, for *Words of Course*, I do now not examine; but what have *Words of Course* to do in a printed Law? They might as well tell the Parliament in plain terms, that they Lied, or that they spake they knew not, or regarded not what; as tell them that their Words were but *Words of Course*. If these *Words of Course* were not true, why did they not confute them then, when all things were fresh in Men's Memories? No Man can believe that they did forbear out of Affection to the Parliament, but because they could not then oppose so Evident Truth.

Yet they conclude it to be evident, that there were no such Records of Parker's Consecration. This is more than Words of Course, to charge the Parliament directly with an Untruth. But how is it evident that there were no such Records? because they were never produced to those Roman Catholick Doctors, who desired to see some Evidence of Parker's

ker's Consecration. This is wonderful. They were cited in print, they were alledged by the Parliament in the Publick *Laws* of the Kingdom, of which no Man can plead Ignorance ; and yet they tell us they were never produced. But to satisfie their very Pretensions. Their Exceptions in those days were of another Nature, either against our *English Ordinal*, or against the *Legality* of our Bishops ; which latter Exception hath been answered already, and the former shall be answered in due place. The Reason why Bishop *Jewel*, and Bishop *Horne*, and others did not cite these Records more expressly, was no Dread at all lest they should be found to be Counterfeit, but because they had no need to cite them, to answer any thing that was objected against them. Either the *Roman Catholick* Writers of those days were false to their own Interest, to smother a thing, which (if it had been true) had been so much to their Advantage ; which no rational Man can imagine : Or the *Nagg's-head* Ordination was altogether unknown and unheard of in those Days, which is most certain.

But now the Fathers change their Note, *could they not be forged as well in Queen Elizabeth's time, as in King James his Reign ?* This is to blow hot and cold with the same Breath. Before they demanded, *how it was possible they should be extant then and not produced ?* Now they tell us, they might be extant then, and yet forged : Nay, such a Dexterity they have in turning all which they touch into Gold, that they make this very Supposition, that they were extant then, to be a Proof against us that they were forged. Therefore they were not produced, because *in Queen Elizabeth's time many were living, who would have proved them to be forged.*

Observe First, What Honour and Respect our Countrymen do bear to our Princes and Parliaments united. Before they did as good as give them the Lie, and now they make them at the least Accessaries to Forgery, so far as to avouch and justify forged Records. Secondly, Observe with what Confidence and Conscience they say that these Records were never produced ; And yet confess

selfs that they were cited in Print, and alledged in our very Statutes. If Bishop *Jewel* and Bishop *Horne* had cited them, (as they would have cited them if they had had occasion,) they could have done no more than was done. Did any Man, upon this Publication, go about to convince them of Forgery? No I warrant you, the Case was too plain to be convinced. The Parliament, and the Book of the Lives of the seventy Archbishops of *Canterbury*, Printed by *John Day*, Anno 1572. have spoiled the Fathers Arguments, (*They were not produced, therefore they were forged*) and furnished us with a demonstrative Proof of the contrary. They were produced and cited in Print, and neither convinced, nor so much as accused of Forgery; Therefore they were not forged.

It seemeth this Answer did not satisfie the Fathers themselves; and therefore one of them hath added a second Answer in the Margent, with his Pen, in these words; *The Act of Parliament relates only to the Records of the Queen's Letters Patents, and not to the Records of the Bishops Consecration or Ordination.* They say that Gloss is accursed, which corrupteth and contradicteth the Text, as this Gloss doth egregiously. The Statute speaketh expressly, of *the Records of Elections, and Confirmations, and Consecrations*, which are all of them Ecclesiastical Acts, and none of them Recorded in the Rolls of Chancery, or any other Civil Court of Records, but only in the Ecclesiastical Registers of the Archbishops, Deans and Chapters respectively. This Answer is a groundless Evasion.

My Fifth Ground, to prove that these Records were not forged, is taken from that Book of the Lives of the seventy succeeding Archbishops of *Canterbury*, Printed in *London*, in the year 1572. wherein the Author, (that was Archbishop *Parker* himself.) having described the Confirmations and Consecrations of Bishop *Grindall*, Bishop *Sands*, Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Horne*, and all the rest of those first Protestant Bishops, he addeth in the Margent, *Hæ confirmationes & consecrationes in Registris apparent.*
These

These Confirmations and Consecrations do appear in the Registers: Then the Registers were then extant, and not only extant, but publickly Printed, whilst all things were fresh in Mens Memories, yet no Man did or durst except against the Truth of them; so free they were, not only from Corruption, but from Suspicion.

The *Sixth* and *Last* Ground, to prove that the Records were not forged, is taken from the Agreement and Concurrence of our Civil Records (which no Man ever doubted of) with our Ecclesiastical Registers. We have seen the Queen's Letters Patents, directed to seven other Bishops, for the Confirmation and Consecration of Archbishop Parker, Dated the sixth of December, Anno 1559. Therefore upon the sixth of December, 1559. he was neither Confirmed nor Consecrated. We have seen the Ecclesiastical Records, how, by Virtue of those very Letters Patents, he was Confirmed upon the *ninth* day, and Consecrated upon the *seventeenth* day of the same Month. We find three other Letters Patents, directed to Archbishop Parker himself, as a Consecrated Bishop, for the Confirmation and Consecration of other Bishops; namely Richard Cox, Edmund Grindall, and Edwin Sandes, dated the *eighteenth* of December, that is, the very next day after his Consecration; therefore he was then Consecrated. And this agrees exactly with the Ecclesiastical Register.

Elizabeth' Dei gratia Angliæ &c. Reverendissimo in Christo Patri & Domino, Matthæo Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ Primati & Metropolitano, &c. Salutem. Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundem Magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Divi Pauli London' prædictæ sic ut præfertur Electum, Electionemque prædictam Confirmare, & eundem Magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt Officio pastoralis, &c. Teste Regina

gina apud Westmonasterium, decimo Octavo die Decembris, Anno Reginae Elizabeth' Angliae, &c. secundo.

Examinatur per

RICH. BROUGHTON.

Consimilia Brevia (Eisdem forma & verbis, mutatis solummodo Mutandis) directa sunt eidem Matthæo Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, pro Confirmatione Electionis, & Consecratione Richardi Cox Sacrae Theologiae Professoris in Episcopum Eliensem, & Edwini Sandes sacrae Theologiae Professoris in Episcopum Wigornensem, Omnia sub dato prædicto & in Rotulo supradicto.

Examinatur per

RICH. BROUGHTON.

There cannot be a clearer Proof in the World, to prove that Archbishop Parker was neither Confirmed nor Consecrated upon the *sixth* of December, Anno 1559. and that he was both Confirmed and Consecrated, and commanded to Consecrate others, upon the *Eighteenth* of the same Month. Neither doth the King, or Church, or Laws of *England*, take notice of any Man as a true Archbishop or Bishop, until Hands be imposed upon him, but always with this Addition (*Elect*) as in the Book of Ordination, *Ego I N. Ecclesiæ atque sedis N. Electus Episcopus profiteor.* And in the Litany, *Te Rogamus ut huic fratri nostro Electo Episcopo Benedictionem & Gratiam tuam largiri digneris.*

Lastly, By the Laws of *England*, a Bishop cannot be admitted to do his Homage, or Swear Fealty for his Bishoprick, nor be restored to his Temporalties, until he be Legally Consecrated: But it is apparent, by the Queen's Letters Patents, Dated the *one and twentieth* day of *March* following (that was at the end of *Hilary Term*, as speedily as could be) he had done his Homage, and was then restored to his Temporalties. Which proveth clearly, that he was Legally Consecrated, that is to say, according to the Register. Such a perpetual Agreement there is, between our Ecclesiastical Records and our Civil Records.

CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

The Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Reasons against that Fabulous Relatiop, from the Authority of our Statutes, the Book of the Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and all other sorts of Witnesses.

The Eighth Reason.

THE Eighth Reason to prove the Naggs-head Ordination to be a Fable, is taken from the Authority of the Statute in the eighth year of Queen Elizabeth, which is thus entitled, *An Act declaring the manner of Making and Consecrating of the Archbishops and Bishops of this Realm, to be good, lawful and perfect.* [An Act declaring] not enacting or making; [the manner of Making and Consecrating the Archbishops and Bishops of this Realm,] that is, those in the Beginning of Q. Elizabeth's time, as appears by the whole Body of the Act; [to be good, Lawful and perfect. The Title of the Statute alone is sufficient to confute this Fable : But there is much more in the Body of the Statute ; as where it approveth the making and Consecrating of the same Archbishops and Bishops to be duly and orderly done, according to the Laws of this Realm. If it was done duly and orderly, according to the Laws of this Realm, then it was not done at the Naggs-head, nor after such a silly ridiculous manner, as these Fathers do relate it. That Form differeth from our Form in all things. In the Consecrator, or Minister of the Consecration ; we must have three Bishops at the least, there was but one. In the Matter ; Our Matter is Imposition of Hands, their Matter was the laying of the Bible upon the Head or Shoulders of the Person Consecrated. In the Form ; Our Form is Receive the Holy Ghost, &c. Their Form was, Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God sincerely.

The Statute proceedeth, that They were Elected, Made and Consecrated Archbishops and Bishops, according to such Order and Form, and with such Ceremonies, in and about their Consecrations, as were allowed and set forth by the said Acts, Statutes and Orders, annexed to the said Book of Common-Prayer before-mentioned. This is plain enough. If the Parliament say truly, then they were Consecrated in a Church, not in a Tavern ; not according to the Brain-

tick,

sick Whimsies of a self-conceited Fool; or rather the ludicrous Device of an Arch-enemy, but according to the Form prescribed by the Church and Kingdom. The Parliament had more reason to know the Truth than these Fathers, for there were personally present both the Persons who did Consecrate, and the Persons who were Consecrated, and many Lords and Gentlemen who were Eye-witnesses of the Consecration. Chuse, Reader, whether thou wilt trust the Tale of a single, obscure malicious Spy, tatling in a corner; or the Affeversion of the Parliament of *England*, in the face of the Sun, publish'd to the World in print.

The Parliament testifieth further, That it is, and may be very evident and apparent, that *no Cause of Scruple, Ambiguity, or Doubt, can or may justly be objected, against the said Elections, Confirmations, or Consecrations.* Do they think the Parliament would have given such Testimony for the *Naggs-head* Consecration. And so they conclude, That *all Persons which had been or should be Ordered or Consecrated, after the Form and Order prescribed, in the said English Ordinal, were in very deed, and by Authority of Parliament were declared and enacted to be, rightly Ordered and Consecrated.* The Scope of the Parliament and of this Act, was to confirm the Consecration of Archbishop *Parker*, and the rest of the Bishops, and to free them from Cavils and Objections: But they confirm no Ordination at the *Naggs-head*, neither can their Words be extended any way to such a ridiculous Consecration: Therefore the Ordination of Archbishop *Parker*, and the rest, was no *Naggs-head* Ordination.

My *Ninth* Reason, to prove that the *Naggs-head* Relation is fabulous and counterfeit, is taken from the Testimony of that Book formerly mentioned, of the Lives of the seventy Archbishops of *Canterbury*; wherein the Consecrations of Archbishop *Parker* and all the rest are particularly related. That which was published to the World in print, above thirty Years before the Death of Queen *Elizabeth*, was not lately forged: But the Legal Ordinations of Archbishop *Parker*, and the rest, ac-

according to the Register, was publish'd to the World in print, above thirty Years before the Death of Queen *Elizabeth*. Again, that which was publish'd to the World in print, with the Allowance of Archbishop *Parker*, or rather by Archbishop *Parker* himself, was not intended by Archbishop *Parker* to be smothered or concealed. Men do not use to publish their Forgeries in print; especially so soon, and of such Publick Actions, whilst there are so many Eye-witnesses living. That the Relation was not confuted; That the Author was never call'd to an Account for it; That no Man stood up against the Registers, nor on the behalf of the *Naggs-head* Ordination in those days; That Mr. *Neale* was so tame to endure the Lie in print, and all his Party so silent, at that time, when the Truth might so easily have been discovered, as if it had been written with a Beam of the Sun, (as it was indeed;) is an evident Proof that our Relation is undeniable, and the Relation which these Fathers make is but a drowsy Dream, which could not endure the light of the Sun.

The Tenth Reason.

The *Tenth* and *Last* Reason to prove our Relation true, and theirs fabulous, is taken from all sorts of Witnesses, ours and theirs indifferently. Mr. *Mason* reckoneth up seven of our Writers, who justified the Legality of our Ordinations, and cited our Registers as authentick Records, before himself; Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Goodwin*, Doctor *Collins*, Mr. *Camden*, Mr. *Selden*, and one who was then living, when this Question was so hotly debated in King *James* his time, and had been an Eye-witness of Archbishop *Parker*'s Consecration at *Lambeth*, that was the *Earl of Nottingham*. One that was well-stor'd with our *English* Writers in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, might add many more; but that cannot well be expected from me, at this distance.

We may produce as many of theirs, who have confessed or been convinced of the Truth of Archbishop *Parker*'s Consecration. First Mr. *Clerke*, whose Father was Register to Cardinal *Pole* in his Legantine Court, and

and he himself an Actuary under him, when *Theophilus Higgins* fled out of England to St. Omers, or Doway, (I remember not well whether.) There he met with this Mr. Clerke, who falling into discourse with him concerning his Reasons why he had forsaken the Church of England, Mr. Higgins told him, that one of them was that Saying of St. Hierome, *It is no Church which hath no Priests*; reflecting upon this Naggs-head Consecration. Mr. Clerke approved well of this Caution, because *In dubiis tutior pars sequenda*; but withal he wished, that what their Authors had written concerning that point, could be made good; confessing that he himself was in England at that time. (The Witness doth not remember whether at the Consecration or not.) But Mr. Clerke said, that he himself was present when the Advocate of the Arches, whom the Queen sent to peruse the Register, after the Consecration, and to give her an Account whether it was performed Canonically, return'd her this Answer, That he had perused the Register, and that no just Exception could be made against the Consecration, But (he said) something might have been better, particularly that Bishop Coverdale was not in his Rober. But he assured her, that could make no Defect in the Consecration. Here we have, if not an Eye-witness, yet at least an Ear-witness, in an undoubted manner, of the Legal Consecration, and of the Truth of the Register, and of the Judgment of the Advocate of the Arches, concerning the Canonicalness of the Consecration. Thus much Mr. Higgins was ready to make Faith of whilst he was living, and Mr. Barwick, a Person of very good Credit, from him at this present.

The Second Witness is Mr. Higgins himself, who coming afterwards into England, had a desire to see the Register, and did see it, and finding those express Words in it (*Milo verò Coverdallus non nisi toga lanea talari utebatur*;) and remembering withal what Mr. Clerk had told him, whereas the Canonical Garments of the rest of the Bishops are particularly described; he was so fully satisfy'd of the Truth of the Consecration, and lawful

Succession of our *English* Bishops, that he said he never made Doubt of it afterwards.

My *Third* Witness is Mr. Hart, a stiff *Roman Catholic*, but a very Ingenuous Person, who having seen undoubted Copies of Doctor Reynolds his Ordination, by Bishop Freake; and of Bishop Freake's Consecration by Archbishop Parker; and *Lastly*, of Archbishop Parker's own Consecration: he was so fully satisfy'd with it, that he himself did raze out all that part of the Conference between him and Doctor Reynolds.

My *Fourth* Witness is Father Oldcorne the Jesuit. This Testimony was urged by me in my Treatise of Schism, in these words; *These authentick Evidences being upon occasion produced, out of our Ecclesiastical Courts, and deliberately perused and viewed by Father Oldcorne the Jesuit, he both confessed himself clearly convinced of that whereof he had so long doubted, (that was the legitimate Succession of Bishops and Priests in our Church) and wished heartily, towards the Reparation of the Breach of Christendom, that all the World were so abundantly satisfied as he himself was; blaming us, as partly guilty of the gross Mistake of many, for not having publicly and timely made known to the World the notorious Falshood of that empty, but far spread, Aspersion against our Succession.* To this the Bishop of Chalcedon, who was better acquainted with the passages of those Times in England, than any of those Persons whom these Fathers stile of undoubted Credit, makes this Confession, *That Father*

Survey c. 9. p.
122.

Oldcorne being in hold for the Powder Treason, and judging others by himself, should say, those Registers to be authentick, is no marvel.

A *Fifth* Witness is Mr. Wadsworth, who, in an Epistle to a Friend in England, doth testifie, that before he left England he read the Consecration of Archbishop Parker in our Registers. This made him so moderate above his Fellows, that whereas some of them tell of five, and the most of them of fifteen, which were consecrated at the

In Ep. ad ami.
n. 55.

Nagg's head, he saith only that the Consecration of the first Protestant Bishop was attempted there, but not accomplished. If it were only attempted

attempted, not accomplished, then the *Nagg's-head* Ordination is a Fable. But it falleth out, very unfortunately for Mr. *Wadsworth's* Attempt, that of all those first Protestant Bishops, whose Elections were all confirmed at *Bow Church* about that time, (and it might be all of them, it is very probable sundry of them, had a Confirmation Dinner at the *Nagg's-head*) not one was confirmed in Person, but all of them by their Proxies; Archbishop *Parker* by Doctor *Bullingham*, Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Scory* by *Walter Jones* Bachelour of Law, Bishop *Grindall* by *Thomas Hink* Doctor of Law, Bishop *Cox* by *Edward Gascoine*, Bishop *Sands* by *Thomas Bentham*, &c. as appeareth by the authentick Records of their Confirmation. Bishops are ordinarily Confirmed by Proxy, but no Man was ever Consecrated, no Man was ever attempted to be Consecrated by Proxy.

The Four next Witnessses are Mr. *Collinton*, Mr. *Laithwait*, Mr. *Faircloth*, and Mr. *Leake*, two of them of the same Order with these Fathers; to whom the Archbishop of *Canterbury* caused these Records to be shewed, in the Presence of himself, the Bishops of *London*, *Durham*, *Ely*, *Bath* and *Wells*, *Lincoln*, and *Rocheſter*. They view'd the Register, they turned it over and over, and perused it as much as they pleased, and in Conclusion gave this Sentence of it, that *the Book was beyond exception*. To say, that afterwards they desired to have the Records into Prison, to peruse them more fully, is ridiculous; such Records may not go out of the Presence of the Keeper; but these Fathers may see them as much as they list in the Registry, if they seek for Satisfaction, not Altercation.

Lastly, Bishop *Bonner* had a Suit with Bishop *Horne*, and the Issue was whether Bishop *Horne* was Legally Consecrated Bishop; upon that Scruple, or rather Cavil, which I have formerly mentioned. If Mr. *Neale*, who they say was Bishop *Bonner's* Chaplain, and sent on purpose to spy what the Bishops did, could have proved the Ordination of Bishop *Horne* at the *Nagg's-head*, he

might not only have cleared his Master, but have turned Bishop *Horn* deservedly out of his Bishoprick. But he was loath to forfeit his Ears, by avouching such a palpable Lie. The *Nagg's-head* Ordination was not talked of in those days. How should it, before it was first devised? Mr. *Sanders* dedicated a Book to Archbishop *Parker*, which he called *the Rock of the Church*: If the *Nagg's-head* Ordination had been a serious Truth, how would he have triumphed over the poor Archbishop?

To conclude, If faith ought to be given to concurring Records, Ecclesiastical and Civil, of the Church and Kingdom of *England*; if a full Parliament of the whole Kingdom deserve any Credit; if the Testimony of the most eminent Publick Notaries of the Kingdom; if Witnesses without exception; if the Silence, or Contradiction, or Confession of known Adversaries, be of any Force; if the strongest Presumptions in the World may have any place, that Men in their right wits will not ruine themselves wilfully, without necessity, or hope of Advantage; if all these Grounds put together do overbalance the clandestine Relation of a malicious Spy, without either Oath, or any other Obligation; then I hope every one who readeth these Grounds, will conclude with me, that the Register of the Church of *England* is beyond all exception, and the malicious Relation of the *Nagg's-head* Ordination, a very Tale of a Tub, and no better; so full of Ridiculous Folly in it self, that I wonder how any Prudent Man can relate it without Laughter.

Who told this to *Bluet*? *Neale*. Who told this to *Herberly*? *Neale*. Who told it to the rest of the Prisoners at *Wisbich*? *Neale*, onely *Neale*. Who suggested it to *Neale*? The Father of Lies. *Neale* made the Fable, *Neale* related it in Corners, long after the time it was pretended to be acted. If his Master Bishop *Bonner* had known any thing of it, we had heard of it long before.

That the Archbishop should leave *Lambeth* to come to *London* to be Consecrated; that he should leave all those Churches in *London*, which are immediately under his

his own Jurisdiction, to chuse a common Tavern, as the fittest place for such a Work ; that Bishop Bonner, being deprived of his Bishoprick, and a Prisoner in London, should send Neale from Oxford, and send a Command by him to one over whom he never had any Jurisdiction ; that the other Bishop, being then a Protestant, should obey him, being a Roman Catholick, when there were so many Churches in the City to perform that Work in, where the Bishop of London never pretended any Jurisdiction ; That these should be treated of, and concluded, and executed all at one Meeting ; that Bishop Bonner did foresee it would be so, and command his Servant to attend there until he saw the End of that Business ; that the Bishops, being about such a Clandestine Work, should suffer a known Enemy to stay all the while in their Company ; is all incredible. If Neale had feigned that he had heard it from one of the Drawers Boys it had deserved more Credit than this silly, improbable, inconsistent Relation, which looketh more like an heap of Fictions, made by several Authors by starts, than a continued Relation of one Man.

Quicquid ostendas mihi sic incredulus odi.

C H A P. VII.

The Nagg's-head Ordination is but a late Device of the Earl of Nottingham, Bishop Bancroft, Doctor Stapleton, the Statute 8 Eliz. 1. and the Queen's Dispensation.

NOW having laid our Grounds ; in the next place let us see what the Fathers have to say further for themselves. *This Story of the Nagg's-head, was first contradicted by Mason in the year 1613. yet so weakly*

and faintly, that the attentive Reader may easily perceive he feared to be caught in a Lye. First, The Fathers seem to argue after this manner ; Many *Athenian* Writers did mention the *Cretan* Bulls, and *Minotaurs*, and *Labyrinth*, but no *Cretan* did write against them ; therefore those ridiculous Fables were true. Rather, the *Cretans* Laughed at their Womanish Revenge, to think to repair themselves for a Beating, with Scolding and Lying ; such ridiculous Fictions ought to be entertained with Scorn and Contempt, *Spreta exoleſcunt, ſi iras caris agnita videntur.*

Secondly, It might be (for any thing I know to the contrary) Mr. *Mason* was the first who dissected this Lie, and laid the Falsity of it open to the World ; but he was not the first who avouched and justified the Canonical Consecration, and Personal Succession of our Protestant Bishops, which is the same thing in effect ; the Bishop of *Hereford* did it before him, and Doctor *Reynolds* before the Bishop of *Hereford*, and he that writ the Life of Archbishop *Parker*, before Doctor *Reynolds* ; and the Parliament before him that writ Archbishop *Parker's* Life ; and the Publick Registers of the Church before the Parliament.

Thirdly, They would make us believe that this Fable was Ancient, and Published to the World from the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* time in Print, and unanswered by the Protestants, until the 13th of King *James* ; but there is no such thing. For their Credit, let them produce one Author that mentioneth it in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* time, or if they cannot do that, for forty years after, that is, before the year 1600 ; or otherwise, the case is plain, that it is an upstart Lie, newly coined about the beginning of King *James* his time. The Fathers would not have us answer it before it was coined, or before it was known to us.

Where they say that Mr. *Mason* did handle this Controversy weakly and faintly, they know they do him wrong ; he hath so thrashed their Authors, *Fitzherbert*, and *Fitzsimon*, and *Holywood*, and *Constable*, and *Kellison*, and *Champney*

and *Champney*, thar the Cause hath wanted a Champion ever since, until these Fathers took up the Bucklers. But whereas they add, that *Mr. Mason* was afraid to be convinced by some aged Persons that might then be living, and remember what passed in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign, is so far from Truth, that *Mr. Mason* nameth a Witness beyond all Exception, that was invited to *Archbishop Parker's* Consecration at *Lambeth*, as being his Kinsman, and was present there, *The Earl of Nottingham*, Lord High Admiral of *England*.

Why did none of their Authors go to him, or employ some of their Friends to enquire of him? The case is clear, they were more afraid of Conviction, and to be caught in a Lie, than *Mr. Mason*; who laid not the Foundation of his Discourse upon loose prittle-prattle, but upon the firm Foundation of Original Records.

They say, in the year 1603, none of the Protestant Clergy durst call it a Fable, as some now do. I am the Man, I did call it so, I do call it so. Such a blind Relation as this is, of a Business pretended to be acted in the Year 1559, being of such consequence, as whereupon the Succession of the Church of *England* did depend, and never published until after the Year 1600, as if the Church of *England* had neither Friends nor Enemies; deserveth to be stiled a *Tale of a Tub*, and no better.

They add, *Bancroft*, Bishop of *London*, being demanded by *Mr. William Alabaster*, how *Parker* and his Collegues were Consecrated Bishops? answered, He hoped that in Case of necessity a Priest (alluding to *Scory*) might ordain Bishops. This Answer of his was objected in Print by *Holywood*, against him and all the English Clergy in the Year 1603. and not a word replied, *Bancroft* himself being then living. And why might not *Holywood* be misinformed of the Bishop of *London*, as well as you your selves were misinformed of the Bishop of *Durham*? This is certain, he could not allude to Bishop *Scory*, who was Consecrated a Bishop in the Reign of *Edward* the sixth, as by the Records of those times appeareth; unless you have a mind to accuse all Records of Forgery. If you have any thing to say against
Bishop

and faintly, that the attentive Reader may easily perceive he feared to be caught in a Lye. First, The Fathers seem to argue after this manner ; Many Athenian Writers did mention the Cretan Bulls, and Minotaurs, and Labyrinth, but no Cretan did write against them ; therefore those ridiculous Fables were true. Rather, the Cretans Laughed at their Womanish Revenge, to think to repair themselves for a Beating, with Scolding and Lying ; such ridiculous Fictions ought to be entertained with Scorn and Contempt, *Spreta exolefcunt, si irascaris agnita videntur.*

Secondly, It might be (for any thing I know to the contrary) Mr. *Mason* was the first who dissected this Lie, and laid the Falsity of it open to the World ; but he was not the first who avouched and justified the Canonical Consecration, and Personal Succession of our Protestant Bishops, which is the same thing in effect ; the Bishop of *Hereford* did it before him, and Doctor *Reynolds* before the Bishop of *Hereford*, and he that writ the Life of Archbishop *Parker*, before Doctor *Reynolds* ; and the Parliament before him that writ Archbishop *Parker's* Life ; and the Publick Registers of the Church before the Parliament.

Thirdly, They would make us believe that this Fable was Ancient, and Published to the World from the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* time in Print, and unanswered by the Protestants, until the 13th of King *James* ; but there is no such thing. For their Credit, let them produce one Author that mentioneth it in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* time, or if they cannot do that, for forty years after, that is, before the year 1600 ; or otherwise, the case is plain, that it is an upstart Lie, newly coined about the beginning of King *James* his time. The Fathers would not have us answer it before it was coined, or before it was known to us.

Where they say that Mr. *Mason* did handle this Controversy weakly and faintly, they know they do him wrong ; he hath so thrashed their Authors, *Fitzberbert*, and *Fitzsimon*, and *Holywood*, and *Constable*, and *Kellison*, and
Champney

and *Champney*, thar the Cause hath wanted a Champion ever since, until these Fathers took up the Bucklers. But whereas they add, that *Mr. Mason* was afraid to be convinced by some aged Persons that might then be living, and remember what passed in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign, is so far from Truth, that *Mr. Mason* nameth a Witness beyond all Exception, that was invited to Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration at *Lambeth*, as being his Kinsman, and was present there, *The Earl of Nottingham*, Lord High Admiral of *England*.

Why did none of their Authors go to him, or employ some of their Friends to enquire of him? The case is clear, they were more afraid of Conviction, and to be caught in a Lie, than *Mr. Mason*; who laid not the Foundation of his Discourse upon loose prittle-prattle, but upon the firm Foundation of Original Records.

They say, in the year 1603, none of the Protestant Clergy durst call it a Fable, as some now do. I am the Man, I did call it so, I do call it so. Such a blind Relation as this is, of a Business pretended to be acted in the Year 1559, being of such consequence, as whereupon the Succession of the Church of *England* did depend, and never published until after the Year 1600, as if the Church of *England* had neither Friends nor Enemies; deserveth to be stiled a *Tale of a Tub*, and no better.

They add, *Bancroft*, Bishop of *London*, being demanded by *Mr. William Alabaster*, how *Parker* and his Collegues were Consecrated Bishops? answered, He hoped that in Case of necessity a Priest (alluding to *Scory*) might ordain Bishops. This Answer of his was objected in Print by *Holywood*, against him and all the English Clergy in the Year 1603. and not a word replied, *Bancroft* himself being then living. And why might not *Holywood* be misinformed of the Bishop of *London*, as well as you your selves were misinformed of the Bishop of *Durham*? This is certain, he could not allude to Bishop *Scory*, who was Consecrated a Bishop in the Reign of *Edward* the sixth, as by the Records of those times appeareth; unless you have a mind to accuse all Records of Forgery. If you have any thing to say against
Bishop

Bishop *Scory's* Consecration, or of any of them who joined in Ordaining Archbishop *Parker*, spare it not, we will not seek Help of an Act of Parliament to make it good.

In sum, I do not believe a Word of what is said of Bishop *Baneroft*, *sub modo* as it is here set down, nor that this Accusation did ever come to the knowledge of that prudent Prelate; if it did, he had greater Matters to trouble his head withal, than Mr. *Holywood's* Babbles: but if ever such a Question was proposed to him, it may be after a clear Answer to the matter of Fact, he might urge this as *argumentum ad hominem*; that tho' both Bishop *Scory* and Bp. *Coverdale* had been but simple Priests, (as they were compleat Bishops,) yet joining with Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Hodgskins*, two undoubted Bishops (otherwise *Gardiner*, and *Bonner*, and *Tunstall*, and *Thurleby*, and the rest, were no Bishops,) the Ordination was as Canonical, as for one Bishop and two Mitred Abbots to Consecrate a Bishop (which you allow in case of Necessity,) or one Bishop and two simple Presbyters to Consecrate a Bishop by Papal Dispensation. So this question will not concern us at all, but them very much, to reconcile themselves to themselves. They teach that the Matter and Form of Ordination are Essentials of Christ's own Institution. They teach that it is grievous Sacrilege to change the Matter of this Sacrament. They teach that the Matter of Episcopal Ordination, is Imposition of Hands by three Bishops, upon the Person Consecrated; and yet with them one Bishop and two Abbots, or one Bishop and two simple Priests, extraordinarily by Papal Dispensation, may ordain Bishops. The Essentials of Sacraments do consist in *indivisibili*, once Essential always Essential, whether ordinarily or extraordinarily, whether with Dispensation or without. So this Question, Whether a Priest, in case of Necessity, may Ordain Bishops? doth concern them much, but us not at all. But for my part I believe the whole Relation is feign'd, for so much as concerns Bishop *Baneroft*.

They

They add, or one of them, *I have spoken with both Catholics and Protestants, that remember near 80 Years, and they acknowledge that so long they have heard the Naggs-head Story related for an undoubted Truth.* Where, I wonder? sooner in Rome, or Rhemes, or Doway, than in England, and sooner in a Corner than upon the Exchange. You have heard from good Authors of the Swans singing, and the Pelicans pricking of her Breast with her Bill; but you are wiser than to believe such groundless Fictions: I produce you Seven of the Ancient Bishops of England, some of them near an hundred Years Old, who do testify that it is a *Groundless Fable*: yet they have more reason to know the right Value of our Ecclesiastical Records, and the Truth of our Affairs, than any whom you converse withal.

The Authors proceed, *This Narration of the Consecration at the Naggs-head, have I taken out of Holywood, Constable, and Doctor Champney's Works.* They heard it from many of the ancient Clergy, who were Prisoners for the Catholick Religion in Wisbich Castle, as Mr. Blewet, Dr. Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, and others. *These had it from the said Mr. Neale, and other Catholics present at Parker's Consecration in the Naggs-head, as Mr. Constable affirms.* Here is nothing but Hearsay upon Hearsay, such Evidence would not pass at a Tryal for a Lock of Goats-wool. *Holy-wood* and the rest had it from some of the *Wisbich* Prisoners, and the *Wisbich* Prisoners heard it from Mr. Neale and others.

What others? had they no Names? did Bishop Bonner send more of his Chaplains than one to be Spectators of the Consecration? and they who were to be Consecrated permit them, being Adversaries, to continue among them during the Consecration, supposed to be a Clandestine Action? It is not credible, without a Plot between Neale and the Host of the Naggs-head, to put him and his Fellows for that day into Drawers Habits, lest the Bishops should discover them. Here is enough said to disgrace this Narration for ever; that the first Authors that publish'd it to the World, did it after the

the Year 1600. until then it was kept close in Lavender. Bishop *Watson* liv'd splendidly with the Bishops of *Ely* and *Rocheſter*, at the time of Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration, and a long time after, before he was removed to *Wibich Caſtle*. If there had been any ſuch thing really acted, and ſo notoriously known, as they pretend, Bishop *Watson*, and the other Priſoners, muſt needs have known it long before that time, when Mr. *Neale* is ſuppos'd to have brought them the firſt News of it. The whole Story is compos'd of Inconſiſtencies. That which quite ſpoileth their Story, is, that Archbishop *Parker* was never preſent at any of theſe Conſecrations, otherwiſe called *Confirmation Dinners* : but it may be the merry Hoſt ſhewed Mr. *Neale* Doctor *Bullingham* for Archbishop *Parker*, and told him what was done in the Withdrawing-room, which (to gain more Credit to his Relation) he feign'd that he had ſeen, out of pure Zeal.

However, they ſay the Story was divulged, to the great Grief of the newly Conſecrated, yet being ſo evident a Truth they durſt not contradict it. We muſt ſuppoſe that theſe Fathers have a Privilege to know other Mens Hearts, but let that paſs. Let them tell us how it was divulged, by Word or Writing ? when and where it was divulged, whiſt they were newly Conſecrated ? who divulged it, and to whom ? If they can tell us none of all this, it may paſs for a great Preſumption, but it cannot paſs for a Proof.

But they ſay, that not only the Nullity of the Conſecration, but alſo the Illegality of the ſame was objected in Print againſt them not long after, by that famous Writer Doctor *Stapleton* and others. We look upon Doctor *Stapleton*, as one of the moſt Rational Heads that your Church has had ſince the Separation : But ſpeak to the purpoſe, Fathers, did Doctor *Stapleton* print one Word of the *Naggs-head* Conſecration ? You may be ſure he would not have baulked it, if there had been any ſuch thing ; but he did baulk it, becauſe there was no ſuch thing. No, no, Dr. *Stapleton's* pretended Illegality was upon another ground, becauſe he dreamed that King *Edward's* Statute was repealed

pealed by Queen *Mary*, and not restored by Queen *Elizabeth*, for which we have an exprefs Act of Parliament againſt him in the point ; and his ſuppoſed Invalidity was becauſe they were not Conſecrated *ritu Romano*. If you think Doct^r *Stapleton* hath ſaid any thing that is material, to prove the Invalidity or Nullity of our Conſecration, take your Bows and Arrows and ſhoot over his Shafts again, and try if you do not meet with ſatisfactory Anſwers, both for the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and the Canons of the Catholick Church, and the Laws of *England*.

You ſay, *Parker and the reſt of the Proteſtant Biſhops*, not being able to answer the Catholick Arguments againſt the Invalidity of their Ordination, &c. Words are but Wind. The Church of *England* wanted not Orthodox Sons enough to cope with *Stapleton* and all the reſt of your Emiſſaries ; nor to cry down the illegal and extravagant manner of it at the Naggs-head. How ſhould they cry down that which never had been cry'd up in thoſe days ? We condemn that Form of Ordination, which you feign to have been uſed at the Naggs-head, as *Illegal* and *Extravagant*, and (which weigheth more than both of them) *Invalid*, as much as your ſelves.

They were forced to beg an Act of Parliament, whereby they might enjoy their Temporalties, notwithstanding the known Defects of their Conſecration, &c. O Ingenuity ! whither art thou fled out of the World ? Say, where is this Petition to be found, in the Records of *Eutopia* ? Did the Parliament ever make any ſuch Eſta bliſhment of their Temporalties, more than of their Spiritualties ; Did the Parliament ever take any notice of any Defects of their Conſecration ? Nay, did not the Parliament declare their Conſecration to have been free from all Defects. Nay, doth not the Parliament, quite contrary, brand theſe Reports for ſland^rous Speeches, and juſtify their Conſecrations to have been duly and orderly done, according to the Laws of 8 *Eliz.* cap. 1. *this Realm* : and that it is very evident and apparent, that no Cause of Scruple, Ambiguity, or Doubt, can be juſtly objected againſt their Elections, Confirmations, or Conſecrations.

Yet

Yet they give a Reason for what they say, for albeit Edward the sixth's Rite of Ordination was re-established by Act of Parliament in the first year of Queen Elizabeth; yet it was notorious, that the Ordination at the Nagg's-head was very different from it, and formed extempore by Scory's Puritannical Spirit, &c. I take that which you grant, out of Sanders, that King Edward's Form of Ordination, was re-established by Act of Parliament 1 Elizabethæ; wherein you do unwillingly condemn both Bishop Bonner's and Stapleton's Plea of *Illegality*. The rest which you say, is partly true and partly false. It is is very true, that there is great Difference between the English Form of Ordaining, and your Nagg's-head Ordination, as much as is between the Head of a living Horse and the Sign of the Nagg's-head, or between that which hath a real Entity and an imaginary Chimera (Mr. Mason was the Bellerophon that destroyed this Monster.) But that the Form of the Nagg's-head Ordination was framed extempore by Mr. Scory's Puritannical Spirit, is most false; that Posthumous Brat was the Minerva or Issue of Mr. Neal's Brain, or some others, who fathered this rapping Lie upon him.

Then they repeat the Words of a part of the Statute, and thence conclude, *By which Act appears, that not only King Edward's Rite, but any other used since the Beginning of the Queen's Reign, upon her Commission, was enacted for good, and consequently that of the Nagg's-head might pass. Cujus contrarium verum est.*

The Contrary to what these Fathers infer, doth follow necessarily from those Words which the Fathers cite: The Words of the Act are these (*By virtue of the Queen's Letters Patents, or Commission.*) Every one of the Letters Patents is extant in the Rolls, not one of them did ever authorize any Form, but that which was Legally Established; that is, the Form of Edward the sixth. First, The Queen's Letters Patents, or Commission, hath an *aut minus* in it, or at the least three or four of you: but to justify the Nagg's-head Ordination, the *aut minus* must be altered to at the least one or two of you.

Secondly,

Secondly, The Queen's Letters Patents have always this Clause in them, *Juxta formam & effectum Statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum*; according to the Form and Effect of the Statutes in that case made and provided: But the Statutes allow no less number than Four, or at the least Three to ordain; at the Naggs-head (you say) there was but one Ordainer. Our Statutes prescribe *Imposition of Hands*, as the Essential Matter of Ordination, and these Words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, as the Form of Ordination; but your Nagg's-head Ordination is a meer Phantasm, without Matter or Form; our Statutes allow no such Fanatical and Phantastical Forms, as your Form of the Nagg's-head. And so your Consequence (*Consequently that of the Nagg's-head might pass*) is founder'd on all four, and can neither pass nor repass, unless you can raze these Words (*by virtue of the Queen's Letters Patents*) out of the Statute, and insert these (*without the Queen's Letters Patents*); and likewise raze these Words out of the Commission (*according to the Form and Effect of the Statutes*), and insert these [*contrary to the Form and Effect of the Statutes*]. A single Falsification will do your Cause no good. Two Poisons may perchance help it at a dead lift.

It is in vain to tell us, that Mr. Mason saw this over-clear to be denied, who know better that Mr. Mason did not only deny it over and over again, but squeezed the poor Fable to Dirt. I have shewed you particularly what was the End of the Queen's Dispensations, the same which is the End of Papal Dispensations, to meet with latent Objections or Cavils. I have shewed you what that Cavil was; which needed no Dispensation in point of Law, but only to stop the Mouths of Gain-sayers. But where you add, that *the Queen's Dispensation was given, not in conditional, but in very absolute Terms*: you are absolutely mistaken. The Queen's Dispensation was both in general Terms, which determine nothing (not like the Pope's Dispensations, *A quibusvis excommunicationis suspensionis & interdicti sententiis*): and also in these conditional Terms, *si quid, &c. desit aut dieris eorum quæ per Statuta hujus regni nosiri, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas*

fiasticas in hac parte requiruntur: If any thing is or shall be wanting, which are required by the Laws Civil or Ecclesiastical of this Kingdom. You see it is Conditional; and hath reference only to the Laws of England.

They go on, *the Truth is, all the World laughed at the Naggs-head Consecration, and held it to be invalid, not so much for being performed in a Tavern, as for the new Form invented by Scory. If all the World did laugh at it in those days, they laughed in their sleeves, where no body could see them laugh. It had been too much to laugh at a Jest before it was made, nay before it was devised. The Reader may well wonder, how all the World came to get notice of it so early as the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, and we only in England should hear nothing of it for above 40 years after? but as soon as we did hear of it, we laught at it as well as they, and held it as invalid as they could do for their Hearts; but they laught at it as Bishop Scory's Invention, and we laught at it as theirs.*

C H A P. VIII.

Of Bishop Bonner; the Re-ordination of our Clergy; the Quality of their Witnesses; Mr. Fitzherbert's Suspicions; the Testimony of their Doctors, and the Publishing of our Register before Mr. Mason.

THEIR next Instance is in Bishop Bonner's Case, who was indicted by Mr. Horn, one of the First Protestant Bishops, consecrated by Mr. Parker, or together with him, for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy. The first Error might be pardoned, as being only a mistake in a Word, to say that Bishop Bonner was indicted by Mr. Horn, whereas he was only signified by Bishop Horn: But the second Mistake is fatal, that after all this Confidence, and this great Notoriety of the Naggs-head Ordination to all the World, these Fathers themselves are still uncertain

uncertain, whether *Bishop Horn* were Consecrated by *Arch-bishop Parker*, or at the same time with him; that is as much as to say, they know not certainly what was done at the *Naggs-head*, but they wish, that if the Confirmation-Dinner were not a Consecration, it had been one. It could never end better; for *Mr. Neale*, to feign an Ordination, without an Actuary to Record what was done. *Bishop Watson* and *Mr. Bluet*, and the rest, were much to blame, that (since he had the fortune to wear *Gyges* his Ring, and walk invisible) they did not cause him to play the Publick Notary himself, and draw that which was done there into Acts; then we might have known, as certainly as he could tell us, whether *Dr. Parker* had been Consecrated there by his Proctor *Dr. Bullingham*. It may be, some very credulous Reader, who, like the old *Lamiae*, could take out his Eyes and put them in again when he pleased, would have given more credit *Mr. Neal's* pleasant Fable, than to the publick Rolls and Registers of the Kingdom.

I have handled *Bishop Bonner's* Case before: and these Fathers themselves have unwittingly given Sentence in it against him; That *King Edward's* Form of Ordination, was re-established by Act of Parliament in the first year of *Queen Elizabeth*. But final Sentence there was never any given, until the Parliament gave a final Sentence in it, That *Bishop Horn*, and all the rest, were legal Bishops. To admit a Plea to be tryed by a Jury, and the Verdict of the Jury, are two very distinct things.

They tell us, *He was a Man specially shot at*. Rather he was a Man graciously preserved, by the *Queen's* Mercy, from the Rage of the Common People against him. If they had shot at him, they could have found ways enough to have tendered the Oath of Supremacy to him, without *Bishop Horn*. I profess I am no great Patron of such Oaths, Men have more Dominion over their Actions than over their Judgments: Yet there is less to be said for *Bishop Bonner*, than for other Men. He who had so great a hand in framing the Oath; He who had taken it himself, both in *King Henry's* time;
F and

and King *Edward's* time, and made so many others to take it ; He who had been so great a Stickler in *Rome* for the King's Supremacy, who writ that Preface before Bishop *Gardiner's* Book *de vera Obedientia* : if he had suffered by the Oath of Supremacy, he had but been scourged with a Rod of his own making.

Their next Reason, to prove the Nullity of our Holy Orders, is taken from *the constant Practice of the Roman Catholicks, to Re-ordain Protestant Ministers, not conditionally but absolutely*, which they call *an evident Argument of our meer Laity*. A doughty Argument indeed, drawn from their own Authority. Can any Man doubt, that they, which make no Scruple of taking away our Lives, will make Conscience of taking away our Orders ? this is that which we accuse them of, and they do fairly beg the Question. If Re-ordination be Sacrilege (as they say it is,) we are ready to convince them of gross Sacrilege, or iterating of all the Essentials of Ordination, the same Matter and the same Form that is for Episcopacy, the same Imposition of Hands by three Bishops, and the same Words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, &c. Some were of the same Mind with these Fathers, in Queen *Mary's* time : but *Paul the IV.* and Cardinal *Pole* were wiser, who confirmed all Ordinations in *Edward the sixth's* time indifferently, so the Persons professed but their Conformity to the *Roman Religion*. How doth this consist with your pretended Nullity ?

They say, *Our Records were produced by Mr. Mason in the year 1613, fifty years after they ought to have been shewed*. They forget that they were published in Print in Archbishop *Parker's* Life-time, that they were justified by the Parliament 8 *Elizabethæ*, that all of them go hand in hand with our Civil Records.

He saith, *it cannot be testified by any Lawful Witnesses (produced by us) that they were not forged*. This is their Method, first to accuse us of Forgery, and then to put us to prove a Negative ; where learnt he this Form of Proceeding ? By all the Laws of God and Man the Accuser is to make good his Accusation ; yet we have given

ven him Witnesses beyond all Exception. They say, *there cannot be a more evident Mark of Forgery, than the Concealment of Registers, if they be Useful and Necessary to the Persons in whose Custody they are.* The Proof lieth on the other hand. Tell us how they were concealed, which were published to the World in Print, by a whole Parliament, by private Persons, and were evermore left in a Publick Office, where all the World might view them from time to time, who had either occasion or desire to do it? That our Adversaries did *insult and Triumph over us*, is but an Empty Flourish without Truth or Reality, as we shall see presently.

They say, *It is not worth refuting which some modern Protestants say, Ye have no Witnesses of the Story of the Naggs-head, &c. but Roman Catholicks, we value not their Testimony, because they are known Adversaries.* This Answer they term *Ridiculous*, and parallel it with the Answer of an Officer in Ireland. You will not find this Answer so ridiculous, upon more serious Consideration. Protestants know that some Exceptions in Law, do destroy all all Credit, and some other Exceptions do only diminish Credit. An Adversary's Testimony may be admitted in some Cases, but it is subject to Exceptions, and makes no full Proof, especially in cases favourable in the Law, as the Case of Persons spoiled (which is your *Irish Case*,) such Witnesses may be admitted, *ante omnia spoliatus restitui debet*: but then they ought to make up in Number, what they want in Weight.

But you mistake wholly, our Answer is not, that you produce no Witnesses for the Story of the Naggs-head but Roman Catholicks: Our Answer is, that you produce no Witnesses at all, neither Roman Catholicks nor others. For first, one Witness is no Witness in Law; let him be beyond Exception duly Sworn and Examined, yet his Testimony makes but *semiplenam probationem*, half a Proof; especially in Criminal Causes, such as this is, it is nothing. One Witness shall not rise up against a Man for any Iniquity or any Sin; at the Mouth of two Witnesses, or at the Mouth of three Witnesses shall the Matter be sta-

Deut. 19

15.

established. Which Law is confirmed by our Saviour?

Mat. 18. 16. They were never yet able to pretend any Eye-witness by Name, but Mr. Neale, or some-body that had no Name, because he had no Being in the nature of things ; all the rest had it from Mr. Neal's single Testimony, because they cannot testify what was done, but what Mr. Neale said.

Secondly, Mr. Neale testifieth nothing, as a single Witness ought to testify. He was never sworn to speak the Truth ; he never testified it before a Publick Notary ; he was never examined before a competent Judge ; he was never produced before the Face of a *Protestant*. Is this the manner of the *Romans* now a-days, to condemn whole Churches upon the verbal Testimony of a single Witness, before he be brought Face to Face with those whom he accuseth ; and such a Testimony which is clogged with so many Improbabilities and Incongruities, and Incoherences, that no rational, impartial Man can trust one Syllable of it ? whereas, in such a Case as this, against the third Estate of the Kingdom, against the Records Civil and Ecclesiastical, against the Testimony of a Parliament, an hundred Witnesses ought not to be admitted.

We regard not Mr. *Fitzherbert's* *Suspitions* at all. What are the *Suspitions* of a private Stranger, to the well-known Credit of a Publick Register ? His *Suspitions* can weigh no more than his *Reasons*, that is, just nothing. He saith *this Exception is no new Quarrel, but was vehemently urged to the English Clergy in the beginning of the Queen's Reign, to shew how and by whom they were made Priests, Bishops, &c.* You have said enough to Confute your selves, but you touch not us. If they had known that they were Consecrated at the *Nagg's head*, as well as you would seem to know it, they needed not to urge it so vehemently to shew how and by whom they were ordained ; they would have done that for them readily enough : unless perhaps, you think that they concealed the *Nagg's head* Ordination out of favour to the *Protestants*. But I see you are mistaken in this, as in
all

all other things. There was an old Objection indeed, that our Consecrators were not *Roman Catholicks*, and that our Consecration was not *Ritu Romano*, or that we were not Ordained by Papal Authority : but by the *Nagg's-head* Ordination is a new Question. What might be whispered underhand, in the Ears of the credulous Persons of your own Party in Corners, we do not know : But for all your contrary Intimation, none of all your Writers did dare to put any such thing in Print, for above forty years after Archbishop Parker's Consecration. If *silent Witnesses*, in such Circumstances, prove more than others, as you affirm, then all your Writers are our Witnesses. But none of all your Doctors did ever urge any such thing, as required that ever we should cite the Registers, in prudence, as by a clear Answer to all your Testimonies shall appear. The Water did not stop there in those Days ; yet even in Archbishop Parker's Life-time, the Consecration of our Bishops was Published to the World in Print ; Either shew as much for your *Nagg's-head* Ordination, or hold your peace for ever. Bishop Andrews, the Learned Bishop of Winchester's Absurdities, Falsities and Lies, are easily talked of, Men talk of Black Swans ; but he who hath laid your greatest Champions in the Dust, requires another manner of Discoverer than Mr. Fitzherbert.

But these Fathers are resolved to Confute themselves, without the Help of an Adversary. They tell us, that *no mention was ever made of Registers, testifying Parker's Consecration at Lambeth, until Mr. Mason Printed his Book.* This is not true ; they were mentioned by the Parliament, mentioned in Print, I think before Mr. Mason was Born ; what though *Lambeth* were not mentioned, if the Legality of the Consecration were mentioned ? This is enough to Answer your Objection ; this is enough to Confute your Romance of the *Nagg's-head*. Yet thus much your selves confess, in the same Paragraph, that in a Book Printed in the Year 1605. (that is eight Years before the Year 1613. wherein you say that Mr. Mason Printed his Book) called *Antiquitates Britanniae*,

there is a *Register of the Protestant Bishops of England*: Then there was a Register of the Consecration of Protestant Bishops extant, before Mr. *Mason* did write of that subject. You say, that Register doth not mention any certain Place or Form of their Consecration. It was not needful; the Law prescribeth the Form, and the Place was indifferent, so it was a Consecrated place, which the Law doth likewise prescribe. But you tell us further, that this Register was forged or foisted in, and that your Learned, but Nameless, Friend, saw the old Manuscript of that Book, wherein there is no mention of any such Register, which you tell us, in your Friends words, that all the World may see how this Register was forged. Why are the World bound to believe your Friend? How shall we give Credit to a Man who tells us three notorious Untruths in four Lines? First, That it is pretended that Archb. *Parker* was made a Bishop by Barlow, Scory, and three others, by virtue of a Commission from Queen Elizabeth: he was made a Bishop by Barlow, Scory, and two others. Secondly, That this work was acted on the 17th day of September, Anno 1559. which was acted on

Pag. 10.

the 17th Day of December, 1559. Thirdly, That we had no Form then, or Order to do such a Business; whereas you your selves confess, That Edward the sixth's Rite of Ordination was re-established in the First year of Queen Elizabeth: and Archbishop *Parker's* Ordination was in the Second of Queen Elizabeth. He who stumbles so thick and threefold, may err in his viewing the Manuscript, as well as the rest. But, to gratify you, suppose it was foisted in, what good will that do you? It must of necessity be foisted in before it was Printed, it could not be foisted in after it was Printed; and it must be foisted by a Protestant, for no Roman Catholick would foist it in. So still you see a Register of Protestant Bishops, was Published to the World in Print, eight Years before Mr. *Mason* Published his Book.

Your Friend saith, That this Printed Book of *Parker's Antiquitates Britanniae*, is the first that mentioned any such pretended Consecration of him and the rest. So it might be well

well, when it was first Printed, that was not in the year 1605. but in Archbishop Parker's Life-time, three years before his Death, Anno 1572. So much you might have learned from the very Title-page of the Book, Printed at *Hannow*, *Historia antebac non nisi semel, nimirum Londini, in Aedibus Johannis Day, Anno 1572. excusa*: That this History was Printed formerly at London, in the House of John Day, in the year 1572. This doth utterly destroy the Credit of your Friend's Relation, that he had viewed the Manuscript of that Book. There needed no Manuscript, where they had a Printed Book for their Copy (as the Title-page telleth us they had) and that Printed above sixty years before your Friend Writ, it is probable before his Birth. If there be any thing of foisting in the Case, there is rather something foisted out of the former Edition, than foisted in; namely, Archbishop Parker's Life until that time, with the particular Consecrations of our first Bishops, which were in the *London* Edition, and are omitted in this Edition of *Hannow*. This is clear enough by the very Title, *An History of seventy Archbishops*, and there are in this Edition but sixty nine Archbishops, because the Life of Archbishop Parker is wanting; which nevertheless is promised in the Life of Archbishop Warham pag. 312. (ut in Matthæi Parker Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi vita inferius dicemus) As we shall say hereafter in the Life of Matthew Parker Archbishop of Canterbury. You see how unfortunate you are in accusing others of Forgery.

Your Author proceedeth, *Any Man, reading the Printed Book, will manifestly see it is a meerly foisted and inserted thing having no Connexion, Correspondence or Affinity, either with that which goeth before, or followeth it.* Say you so? There was never any thing more fitly inserted. The Author undertaketh to write the Lives of 70 succeeding Archbishops of Canterbury, from *Austin* to *Matthew Parker*, and having premitted some general Observations concerning the Antiquity of Christian Religion in *Britany*, with the Names of some Archbishops of *London*, and the O-

original and Changes of Episcopal Sees in England, and some other Generalities concerning the Privileges of the See of *Canterbury*, and the Conversion of *Kent*; just before he enters upon the Life of *St. Austin* the first Archbishop, he presenteth the Reader with a Summary View of the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury*, at that time when the Book was first Printed in the year 1572, with the Names of all the Bishops of the Province at that time, their Countries, their Arms, both of their Sees and of their Families, their respective Ages, their Universities, their Degrees in Schools, with the Times of their several Consecrations, if they were ordained Bishops, or Confirmations, if they were translated from another See. It is hardly possible for the Wit of Man to contrive more Matter in a lesser Room. Then, he sets down a like Table for the Province of *York*: and lastly, an Alphabetical Catalogue of the Bishops whose Lives were described in this Book, and among the rest, Archbishop *Parker*, whose Life (if you call it *foisting*) is foisted out of this *Hannow* Edition. If this hath no *Connexion* or *Affinity* with that which goeth before, and followeth after, I know not what *Connexion* or *Affinity* is.

Your Friend's last Exception against the Authority of that Book called *Antiquitates Britanniae*, is, that it containeth more things done after Matthew *Parker* had written that Book. So you confess that Archbishop *Parker* himself (about whom all our Controversy is,) was the Author of that Book; wherein I agree with you. The Conclusion of the Preface, and many others Reasons invite me to do so. Surely this Author meant that there is something contained in this Register, which is not within the compass of the following Lives in the *Hannow* Edition (that may well be, because *Matthew Parker's* Life is foisted out in this Edition:) but there is nothing which was not in the *London* Edition, much more largely than it is in this Register, especially for the Confirmations and Consecrations of our *Protestant* Bishops: there is nothing after the Time when this Register was made, which is prefixed in the Frontispiece of
it

It in the *Harrow* Edition, with M. P. for *Matthew Parker* died May the 27, Anno 1575, he printed his Book at *London* three Years before his Death, without the Author's Name, in the year 1572.

I appeal to the ingenuous Reader, (let him be of what Communion he will, or never so full of prejudice,) whether it be credible, that *Archbishop Parker's* own Book should be printed in *London*, by the Queen's Printer, in his Life-time, and have any thing foisted in it contrary to his Sense.

Here then we have 'a Register of *Protestant* Bishops, with their Confirmations and Consecrations, published to the World in Print at *London*, by *Archbishop Parker* himself, (who was the Principal Person and most concerned in that Controversy,) as if it should dare all the Adversaries of our Church to except against it, if they could. Registers cannot be concealed, being always kept in the most publick and conspicuous Places of great Cities, whither every one hath access to them who will. They need no Printing, but this was printed (a Work of Supererogation.) They who dared not to except against it then, when it was fresh in all Mens Memories, ought not to be admitted to make conjectural Exceptions now.

Now the Fathers come to shew, how their Doctors did object to our *Protestant* Clergy, the Nullity and Illegality of their Ordination. If their Doctors give a Cause or Reason of their Knowledge, we are bound to answer that; but if they object nothing but their own Judgment and Authority, we regard it not; their Judgment may weigh something with them, but nothing at all with us. This is not to make themselves Advocates, but Judges over us, which we do not allow. If I should produce the Testimonies of fourscore *Protestant* Doctors, who affirm that we have a good Succession, or that their Succession is not good, what would they value it?

The first is Dr. *Bristow*; Consider what Church that is, whose Ministers are but very Lay-men, unsent, uncalled, unconsecrated, holding therefore amongst us, when they repent and
return,

return, no other place but of Lay-men, in no case admitted, no nor looking to Minister in any Office, unless they take Orders, which before they had not. Here is Doctor Bristow's Determination, but where are his Grounds? He bringeth none at all, but the Practice of the *Roman Church*, and that not general. *Paul the 4th*, and *Cardinal Pole*, and the Court of *Rome* in those days, were of another Judgment, and so are many others; and so may they themselves come to be, when they have consider'd more seriously of the matter, that we have both the same old Essentials. That which excuseth their Re-ordination from formal Sacrilege (for from material it cannot be excused, upon their own grounds,) is this, that they cannot discover the Truth of the matter of Fact, for the hideous Fable raised by our Country-men.

But were is the *Naggs-head* Ordination in Dr. Bristow? Then had been the time to have objected it, and printed it, if there had been any Reality in it. Either Dr. Bristow had never heard of this merry Pageant, or he was ashamed of it. Here we meet with Dr. Fulke again, and what they say of him shall be answered in its proper place.

Their next Witness is Mr. Reinolds, *There is no Herds-man in all Turkey, who doth not undertake the Government of his Herd, upon better Reason, and greater right Order and Authority, than these your magnificent Apostles, &c.* And why an Herds-man in Turkey? but only to allude to his Title of *Calvino Turcismus*. An Herds-man in Turkey has as much right to order his Herd, as an Herds-man in *Christendom*; unless perhaps your Dr. did think, that Dominion was founded in Grace, not in Nature. This is saying, but we expect proving. It is well known that you pretend more to a *magnificent Apostolate*, than we. If the Authority of the Holy Scripture (which knoweth no other Essentials of Ordination, but *Imposition of Hands*, and these Words *Receive the Holy Ghost*,) if the perpetual Practice of the Universal Church, if the Prescription of the ancient Council of *Carthage*, and above two hundred Orthodox Bishops, with the concurrent Approbation

probation of the Primitive Fathers, be sufficient Grounds, we want not sufficient Grounds for the Exercise of our Sacred Functions. But on the contrary, there is no *Herds-man in Turkey* who hath not more sufficient Grounds or Assurance of the Lawfulness of his Office, than you have for the Discharge of your Holy Orders upon your own Grounds. The *Turkish Herds-man* receives his Master's Command, without examining his Intention: but according to your Grounds, if in an hundred successive Ordinations, there were but one Bishop who had an Intention not to Ordain, or no Intention to Ordain, or but one Priest who had an Intention not to Baptize, or no Intention to Baptize any of these Bishops, then your whole Succession cometh to nothing.

But I must still ask, where is your *Naggs-head* Ordination in all this? Mr. *Reinolds* might have made a pleasant Parallel between the *Naggs-head* Ordination, and the Ordination of the *Turkish Musti*, and wanted not a Mind mischievous enough against his Mother, the Church of *England*, if he could have found the least pretext; but there was none. You seek for Water out of a Pumice.

Their third Witness is Dr. *Stapleton*, in his Counterblast against Bishop *Horn*. *To say truly, you are no Lord Winchester, nor elsewhere, but only Mr. Robert Horn. Is it not notorious that you and your Collegues were not Ordained according to the Prescript, I will not say of the Church, but even of the very Statutes? How then can you challenge to your self the Name of the Lord Bishop of Winchester? You are without any Consecration at all of your Metropolitan, himself Poor Man being no Bishop neither.* This was a loud Blast indeed; but if Dr. *Stapleton* could have said any thing of the *Naggs-head* Ordination, he would have given another manner of Blast, that should have made the whole World eccho again with the Sound of it.

In vain you seek any thing of the *Naggs-head* in your Writers, until after the year 1600. For Answer, Dr. *Stapleton* raiseth no Objection from the Institution of Christ, whereupon, and only whereupon, the Validity or Invalidity of Ordination doth depend; but only from the
Laws

Laws of England. *First*, for the Canons, we maintain that our Form of *Episcopal Ordination* hath the same Essentials with the *Roman*; but in other things, of an inferiour alloy, it differeth from it. The Papal Canons were never admitted for binding Laws in *England*, further than they were received by our selves, and incorporated into our Laws; but our Ordination is conformable to the *Canons* of the *Catholick Church*, which prescribe no new Matter and Form in Priestly Ordination. And for our Statutes, the Parliament hath answered that Objection sufficiently, shewing clearly, that the Ordination of our first *Protestant* Bishops was legal, and for the Validity of it, we crave no Man's Favour.

Their last Witness is Dr. *Harding*, who had as good a Will (if there had been any Reality in it) to have spoken of the *Naggs-head* Ordination as the best, but he spaketh not a Syllable of it, more than the rest; and though they keep a great stir with him, he brings nothing that is worth the weighing. *First*, he reads us a profound Lecture, that *Sacerdos* signifieth both a Priest and a Bishop. Let it signify so, and in St. *Hierom's* Sense; what will he infer from thence? *Next*, he asks Bishop *Jewell* of *Bishoply and Priestly Vocation and Sending*. What new canting Language is this? Could he not as well have made use of the old Ecclesiastical word of *Ordination*? *Thirdly*, he taxeth the Bishop, that he answereth not by what Example Hands were laid on him, or who sent him. What doth this concern any Question between them and us? Hands were laid on him by the Example of Christ, of his Apostles, of the Primitive and Modern Church; so Christ sent him, the King sent him, the Church sent him, in several respects. He tells us, that when he had duly considered his Protestant Ordination in *Edward's* time, he did not take himself for lawful Deacon in all Respects. If his Protestant Ordination were a Nullity (as these Men say,) then he was a lawful Deacon in no respect. Pope *Paul* the 4. and Cardinal *Pole* were of another Mind. Then follow his two grand Exceptions against our Ordination, wherein you shall find nothing of the your
Naggs-

Naggs-head Fable. The former Exception is, that King Edward's Bishops who gave Orders, were out of Orders themselves. The Second is, that they Ministered not Orders according to the Rite and manner of the Catholick Church. For the former Exception, I refer him to the Council of Carthage in St. Austin's time, and for both his Exceptions to Cardinal Pole's Confirmation of King Edward's Bishops and Priests, and Paul the 4th's. Ratification of his Act. If any Man have a mind to enquire further into the Validity of our Form of Ordination, let him leave these Fables, and take his Scope freely.

To all this they say, that Bishop Jewell answers with profound Silence; yet they add, only he says, without any Proof, that their Bishops are made by Form and Order, and by the Consecration of the Archbishop and other three Bishops, and by Admission of the Prince. I expected profound Silence, but I find a profound Answer; this is the first time I learned how a Man can both keep profound Silence and answer so pertinently all at once. How doth Dr. Harding go about to take away this Answer: For Bishop Jewell was the Defendant, and the Burthen of the Proof did not rest upon him? First, I pray you, how was your Archbishop consecrated? If Dr. Harding did not see his Consecration, he might have seen it if he would. He asks further, What three Bishops were there in the Realm to lay hands upon him? Ask the Queen's Letters Patents, and they will shew you seven. What a weak Socratical kind of Arguing is this, altogether by Questions, without any Inference? If Dr. Harding could have said it justly, (and he could have said it, if it had been so,) he should have confuted him boldly, and told him, your Metropolitan was consecrated in the *Naggs-head*, by one single Bishop, in a Fanatical and Fantastical manner: But he did not, he durst not do it, because he knew it to be otherwise, and it was publicly known to be otherwise. All this Exception is against our Form, If you had been Consecrated after the Form and Order which hath ever been used, you might have had Bishops out of France, or at home in England. It is the Form established in King
Edward's

Edward's time, and restored in *Queen Elizabeth's* time, which *Dr. Harding* impugneth, not that ridiculous Form which they Father upon *Bishop Scory* : and their chief Objection against that Form, was that vain Cavil, that it was not restored by Act of Parliament, which since hath been answered abundantly by an Act of Parliament. Hereupon he tells *Bishop Jewell*, that *his Metropolitan had no Lawful Consecration*. Though his Consecration had not been Lawful, yet it might have been Valid, but it was both Legal and Valid. This is all that *Dr. Harding* hath, which a much meaner Scholar than that learned Prelate might have adventured upon, without fear of burning his Fingers.

Their next Proof against our Records, is taken from the Contradictions of our Writers, *Mr. Mason's Registers and Records*, disagree with those that *Mr. Goodwin* used in his Catalogue of Bishops, sometimes in the Day, sometimes in the Month, sometimes in the Year. And again, *Mr. Mason*, *Sutcliffe*, and *Mr. Butler*, all speaking of *Mr. Parker's Consecration*, do all differ one from another in naming his Consecrators ; *Mr. Mason* saith it was done by *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and *Hodgkins*. *Mr. Sutcliffe* saith, besides the three First, there were two Suffragans. *Mr. Butler* saith, the Suffragan of *Dover* was one, who is not named in the Commission. So as these Men seem to have had three Disagreeing Registers. I answer, First, that it is scarcely possible to avoid Errors in transcribing and printing of Books, in the Author's Absence, especially in Names and Numbers. To keep a bawling and a stir about these *Errata* of the Pen or of the Press, is like the barking of little Currs, which trouble the whole Vicinage about the Moon shining in the Water. Such were the most of these.

Secondly, Supposing that some very few of these were real Mistakes of the Author's, yet innocent Mistakes, which have no Plot in them, or Design of Interest or Advantage, which conduce neither *pro* nor *contra* to any Controversy that is on Foot, they ought not to be exaggerated or pressed severely ; It is the Wisdom of a

Wiseman

Wifeman to pafs by an Infirmary. Such are all thefe petty Differences. Whether Archbishop *Parker* was confecrated by three City Bifhops and two Suffragans, or by three City Bifhops and one Suffragan Bifhop, and whether this one Suffragan were Suffragan of *Bedford*, or Suffragan of *Dover*, conduceth nothing to any Controverfy which is on Foot in the Church, and fignifieth nothing to the Validity or Invalidity, Legality or Illegality, Canonicalnefs or Uncanonicalnefs of his Ordination. All Memories are not fo happy, to remember Names and Numbers, after a long diftance of time, efppecially if they entered but by the Ear, and were not *Oculis fubjecta fidelibus*. If any Man fhould put me to depofe (wanting my Notes and Memorials,) what Priests did impofe hands upon me with Archbishop *Matthews* at my Prieffly Ordination? Or what Bifhop did joyn with my Lord Primate of *Ireland*, at my Epifcopal Ordination? I could not do it exactly. I know there were more than the Canons do require, at either Ordination, and refer my felf to the Register; whether two Suffragans or one Suffragan, is an eafy Miftake, when there are two in the Commiffion, and but one at the Consecration; fo is the Suffragan of *Dover*, for the Suffragan of *Bedford*.

Thirdly, Whether thefe were the Faults of the Pen or the Prefs, or the Author: yet, after Retraction it ought not to be objected. It is inhuman to charge any Man with that Fault, which he himfelf had corrected and amended. Bifhop *Goodwin* Corrected all thefe Errors himfelf, without any Monitor, and Published his Correction of his Errors to the World in Print long fince, in a new Edition of his Book. Likewise Doctor *Sutcliffe* acknowledged his Miftake, and gave order to Mr. *Mafon* to Publish it to the World, as he did.

To ground Exceptions upon the Errors of the Prefs, or the Slips of the Tongue, or Pen, or of the Memory, after they have been publickly amended, is like Flies to delight in Sores, and neglect the Body when it is Sound. I have the fame Error crept into a Book of mine,

mine, of *(five)* for *(four)* how it came, I know not, for the Book was Printed in my Absence, but I have corrected it in my own Copy, and in many Copies of my Friends, where I meet with the Book.

Lastly, There is no Danger in such petty Differences, so long as all Parties do submit themselves to the Publick Registers of the Church, as all these Writers do; although it may be some of them were better acquainted with Polemick Writers, than with Registers, or the Practical Customs of the Church of *England*. The very Reference or Submission of themselves to the Register, is an implicit Retraction of their Errors; as in a City, the Clocks may differ, and the Peoples Judgment of the Time of the Day, but both Clocks and Clerks must submit to the Sun-dial when the Sun shineth out; so all private Memorials must be, and are submitted to the Publick Registers of the Church.

Where these Fathers talk of Plurality of Registers, they err, because they understand not our Customs. Every Bishop, throughout the Kingdom, hath one Registry at least, every Dean and Chapter hath a Registry. The Ordinations of Priests and Deacons, and the Institutions of Clerks to Benefices, are Recorded in the Registers of the respective Bishops, in whose Diocess they are Ordained and Instituted. The Elections of Bishops and Inthornizations and Installations, in the Registry of the respective Deans and Chapters; and the Confirmations and Consecrations of Bishops, in the Registry of the Archbishop where they are Consecrated; except the Archbishop be pleased to grant a Commission to some other Bishops, to Consecrate the Elected and Confirmed Bishops in some other place. But the same thing cannot be Recorded Originally, but in one Registry.

C H A P. IX.

Doctor Whitaker and Doctor Fulke defended; Bishop Barlow's Consecration justified; of John Stow's Testimony, and the Earl of Nottingham's, &c.

HERE the Fathers take upon them the Office of Judges or Censors, rather than of Advocates; *Mr. Mason ought to have answered, as Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Fulke (they were both Eminent Doctors in the Schools) who had reason to be better informed of the Records than he.* How? Nay, nor half so well. They were both Contemplative Men, Cloistered up in *St. John's College*, better acquainted with Polemick Writers, than with Records; they were both Ordained Deacons and Priests Legally, Canonically, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of *England*; and were no such ill Birds to defile their own Nests. If the Records of their Ordination will satisfy you, that they were no Enthusiasts (as you imagine) you may quickly receive Satisfaction: But if they had said any thing contrary to our Laws and Canons, you must not think to wrangle the Church of *England* out of a good Possession, by private voluntary Speculations. Let us see what these Doctors say, as you alledge them, for I have not their Books at present. *Mr. Whitaker saith, I would not have you think we make such reckoning of your Orders, as to hold our own Vocation unlawful without them.* You see Doctor *Whitaker* justifies our Ordination, in this very place, as lawful, and much more plainly elsewhere in his Writings. That *though our Bishops and Ministers be not Ordained by Papistical Bishops, yet they are orderly and lawfully Ordained*: Again, *The Romans account none lawful Pastors, but such as are Created according to their Form or Order.* These are your two main Objections against our Ordination, that we are not Ordained by Bishops of

G

your

mine, of *(five)* for *(four)* how it came, I know not, for the Book was Printed in my Absence, but I have corrected it in my own Copy, and in many Copies of my Friends, where I meet with the Book.

Lastly, There is no Danger in such petty Differences, so long as all Parties do submit themselves to the Public Registers of the Church, as all these Writers do; although it may be some of them were better acquainted with Polemick Writers, than with Registers, or the Practical Customs of the Church of *England*. The very Reference or Submission of themselves to the Register, is an implicit Retraction of their Errors; as in a City, the Clocks may differ, and the Peoples Judgment of the Time of the Day, but both Clocks and Clerks must submit to the Sun-dial when the Sun shineth out; so all private Memorials must be, and are submitted to the Public Registers of the Church.

Where these Fathers talk of Plurality of Registers, they err, because they understand not our Customs. Every Bishop, throughout the Kingdom, hath one Registry at least, every Dean and Chapter hath a Registry. The Ordinations of Priests and Deacons, and the Institutions of Clerks to Benefices, are Recorded in the Registers of the respective Bishops, in whose Diocess they are Ordained and Instituted. The Elections of Bishops and Inthornizations and Installations, in the Registry of the respective Deans and Chapters; and the Confirmations and Consecrations of Bishops, in the Registry of the Archbishop where they are Consecrated; except the Archbishop be pleased to grant a Commission to some other Bishops, to Consecrate the Elected and Confirmed Bishops in some other place. But the same thing cannot be Recorded Originally, but in one Registry.

C H A P. IX.

Doctor Whitaker and Doctor Fulke defended; Bishop Barlow's Consecration justified; of John Stow's Testimony, and the Earl of Nottingham's, &c.

HERE the Fathers take upon them the Office of Judges or Censors, rather than of Advocates; *Mr. Mason ought to have answered, as Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Fulke (they were both Eminent Doctors in the Schools) who had reason to be better informed of the Records than he. How? Nay, nor half so well. They were both Contemplative Men, Cloistered up in St. John's College, better acquainted with Polemick Writers, than with Records; they were both Ordained Deacons and Priests Legally, Canonically, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of England; and were no such ill Birds to defile their own Nests. If the Records of their Ordination will satisfy you, that they were no Enthusiasts (as you imagine) you may quickly receive Satisfaction: But if they had said any thing contrary to our Laws and Canons, you must not think to wrangle the Church of England out of a good Possession, by private voluntary Speculations. Let us see what these Doctors say, as you alledge them, for I have not their Books at present. Mr. Whitaker saith, I would not have you think we make such reckoning of your Orders, as to hold our own Vocation unlawful without them. You see Doctor Whitaker justifies our Ordination, in this very place, as lawful, and much more plainly elsewhere in his Writings. That though our Bishops and Ministers be not Ordained by Papistical Bishops, yet they are orderly and lawfully Ordained: Again, The Romans account none lawful Pastors, but such as are Created according to their Form or Order. These are your two main Objections against our Ordination, that we are not Ordained by Bishops of*

G

your

your Communion. That we are not Ordained according to the *Roman* Form. In both these, Doctor *Whitaker* is wholly for us, against you; that which he maketh no reckoning of, is your Form of Ordination, as it is contradistinct from ours, which it is in many things, especially in your double Matter and Form in Priestly Ordination.

You see Mr. *Fulke* speaks more plainly, Let us hear him. You are highly deceived if you think we esteem your Offices of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, better than Laymen; and with all our Hearts we despise, abhor, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, Antichristian Orders. This is high enough indeed, and might have been express'd in more moderate Terms: but it is to be expounded, not of the Invalidity of your Ordination, as if it wanted any Essential, but partly in respect of the not using or abusing these Sacred Offices, and partly in respect of the Laws of *England*. Excesses may make an Ordination Unlawful, although they do not make it Invalid. Holy Orders are an excellent Grace, conferred by God for the Conversion of Men; but if those who have them, instead of preaching Truth, do teach Errors to his People, and adulterate the old Christian Faith, by Addition of new Articles, they are no longer true Pastors, but Wolves which destroy the Flock; and so they are not only no better, but worse than Laymen, *Corruptio optimi pessima*. In this respect they tell you, that your Priests and Bishops, are no true Priests and Bishops, as *Marcellus* told his Soldiers, that they were no true *Romans* (who were natural *Romans*) because they wanted the old *Roman* Virtue. Lastly, you have habitual Power to exercise these Offices, but you want actual Power in *England*, by reason of the not Application, or rather the Subtraction of the Matter by our Laws; so you are no Legal Bishops or Priests there. This I take to have been the Sense of these two Doctors.

Now we are come to their grand Exception, against Bishop *Barlow*, who was one of the Consecrators of Archbishop *Parker*, whose Consecration is not found in the

the Archbishop's Register, and therefore they conclude that he was never Consecrated. If this Objection were true, yet it doth not render Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration either Invalid or Uncanonical, because there were three other Bishops, who joined in that Consecration, besides Bishop *Barlow*, which is the full number required by the Canons. But this Objection is most false. Bishop *Barlow* was a Consecrated Bishop above 20 Years before the Consecration of Archbishop *Parker*. They should have done well to have proposed this Doubt in Bishop *Barlow's* Life-time, and then they might have had the Testimony of his Consecrators under an Archiepiscopal or Episcopal Seal, for their Satisfaction. The Testimony of the Archiepiscopal Register, is a full Proof of Consecration affirmatively, but it is not a full Proof negatively; such a Bishop's Consecration is not recorded in this Register, therefore he was not Consecrated. For *first*, the Negligence of an Officer, or some cross Accident might hinder the Recording. *Secondly*, Fire, or Thieves, or some such Casualty might destroy or purloin the Record. *Thirdly*, though it be not Recorded in this Register, it may be recorded in another. The Archbishop may, and Archbishop *Cranmer* usually did, delegate or give Commission to three other Bishops for Consecration. And though the Work be ordinarily performed at *Lambeth*, because of the Place, where they may have three Bishops always present, without any further Charge; yet they are not obliged, by any Law, to Consecrate them there. And if there be a sufficient Number of Bishops near the Cathedral which is to be filled, or if the Person who is to be Consecrated do desire it, they may be Consecrated either in that, or any of their own Churches. The Bishops of the Province of *York*, by reason of their former Convenience are usually Consecrated at *Lambeth*, yet I have known in my time Bishop *Sinewes* of *Carlisle* Consecrated at *York* upon his own desire, by the Archbishop of *York*, and the Bishops of *Durham*, *Chester*, and *Man*. A Man might seek long enough for his Consecration

cration in the Archbishop of *Canterbury's Register*, and miss it, but it is to be found in the Register at *York*. So the Omission of it in that Register, though it be no full Proof, yet it is a probable Proof, that Bishop *Barlow* was not Consecrated there ; but it is no Proof at all that he was not Consecrated elsewhere.

And this I take to have been the Case , both of Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Gardiner* : and although the Effluxion of above an hundred Years since, hath rendered it more difficult to find where it was done, yet by help of those Records, which are in the Court of Faculties, I should not despair of finding it yet.

But there are so many evident Proofs that he was Consecrated, that no ingenuous Person can have the Face to deny it. The first Reason is, his actual Possession of four Bishopricks one after another, *St. Asaph*, *St. Davids*, *Bath and Wells*, and *Chichester*, in the Reigns of three Princes. They feign some pretences, why Archbishop *Parker* was not Consecrated Canonically ; because there wanted a competent Number of Bishops, though it were most false : but what can they feign why Bishop *Barlow* was not Consecrated in *Henry* the eighth's time ? was *Henry* the eighth a Baby, to be jested withal ? In Archbishop *Parker's* Case, they suppose all the Bishops to have been stark mad, to cast themselves down headlong from a Precipice, when they had a fair pair of Stairs to descend by ; but in Bishop *Barlow's* Case they suppose all the World to have been asleep ; except there had been such an Universal Sleep, it had been impossible for any Man in those Days to creep into a Bishoprick in *England* without Consecration. To say he is actually possessed of a Bishoprick, therefore he is Consecrated, is a clear Demonstration in the *English Law*, as it is in Nature to say, the Sun shineth, therefore it is Day.

But it may be objected, that he held all these Bishopricks as a Commendatory, not in Title, as an Usufructuary, not as a true Owner. It is impossible, Usufructuaries are not Elected and Confirmed, but Bishop *Barlow* was both Elected and Confirmed. The Congede-
fire

give to the Dean and Chapter, the Letters Patents for his Confirmation, the Commission for the Restitution of his Temporalities, do all prove that he was no Usurfructuary, but a right Owner. This is a *Second Reason*.

Thirdly, The same Letters Patents that do authorize Bishop *Barlow's* Confirmation, did likewise Command the Archbishop, with the Assistance of other Bishops, to Consecrate him himself, or to give a Commission to other Bishops to Consecrate him, which if they did not perform within a prescribed Time, or perform after another manner than is prescribed by the Law, it was not only a Loss of their Bishopricks, by the Law of *England*, but a *Præmunire*, or the Loss of all their Estates, their Liberties, and a casting themselves out of the King's Protection, 25 *Hen. 8. c. 20*. No Men their right Wits would run such a hazard, or rather evidently ruine themselves and all their Hopes, without any need, without any end in the World.

Fourthly, By the same Law no Man could be acknowledged a Bishop in *England*, but he who was Consecrated legally, by three Bishops, with the Consent of the Metropolitan; but Bishop *Barlow* was acknowledged to be a true Bishop; The King received his Homage for his Bishoprick; the King commanded him to be restored to his Temporalities, which is never done till the Consecration be passed. King *Henry* sent him into *Scotland*, as his Ambassador, with the Title of Bishop of *St. Davids*; and in his Restitution to the Temporalities of that See, the King related that *the Archbishop had made him Bishop and Pastor of the Church of St. Davids*. This could not be, if he had not been Consecrated.

Fifthly, He was admitted to sit in Parliament as a Consecrated Bishop: for no Man can sit there as a Bishop, before he be Consecrated; but it is plain, by the Records of the House of Lords, that he did sit in Parliament many times, in the 31 of *Henry the Eighth*, in his Episcopal Habit, as a Consecrated Bishop; and being neither a Bishop of one of the five Principal Sees, nor a Privy Counsellour, he must sit, and did sit, according

to the Time of his Consecration, between the Bishops of *Chichester* and *St. Asaph*. What a strange Boldness is it to question his Consecration now, whom the whole Parliament, and his Consecrators, among the rest, did admit without Scruple then, as a Consecrated Bishop.

Sixthly, There is no Act more proper or Essential to a Bishop, than Ordination. *What doth a Bishop that a Priest doth not*, (saith *St. Hierom*) except Ordination? But it is evident, by the Records of his own See, that Bishop *Barlow* did Ordain Priests and Deacons, from time to time, and by the Archbishop's Register, that he joined in Episcopal Ordination, and was one of those three Bishops who imposed hands upon *Bp. Buckley*, *Feb. 19. 1541*.

Seventhly, There is nothing that trieth a Bishop's Title to his Church more than the Validity or Invalidity of his Leases. If Bishop *Barlow* had been Unconsecrated, all the Leases which he made in the See of *St. Davids*, and *Bath and Wells*, had been Void; and it had been the easiest thing in the whole World for his Successor in those days, to prove whether he was Consecrated or not; but they never questioned his Leases, because they could not question his Consecration.

Lastly, An Unconsecrated Person hath neither Antecessors nor Successors, he succeedeth no Man, no Man succeedeth him. If a Grant of any Hereditaments be made to him and his Successors, it is absolutely void, not worth a deaf Nut; If he alien any Lands belonging to his See, from him and his Successors, it is absolutely void; but Bishop *Barlow* received the Priory of *Brecknock* from the Crown, to him and his Successors Bishops of *St. Davids*; and in King *Edward's* Reign, being Bishop of *Bath and Wells*, he alienated, from him and his Successors, to the Crown, much Land, and received back again, from the Crown to him and his Successors equivalent Lands. If he had been Unconsecrated all these Acts had been utterly void. In sum, whoever dreameth now, that all the World were in a dead Sleep then, for twenty years together, whilst all these things were acting, is much more asleep himself.

To

To these undeniable Proofs I might add as many more, out of the Records of the *Chancery*, if there needed any to prove him a Consecrated Bishop. As,

A Grant to the said *William Barlow* Bishop of *St. Davids*, to hold, in Commendam with the said Bishoprick, the Rectory of *Carew* in the County of *Pembroke*, Dated *Octob. 29. Anno 38 Hen. 8.*

A Commission for Translation of *William Barlow* Bishop of *St. Davids*, to the Bishoprick of *Bath and Wells*, Dated *3. Feb. 2 Edw. 6.*

A Commission for the Consecration of *Robert Farrer* to be Bishop of *St. Davids*, *per translationem Willelmi Barlow*, &c. Dated *3. Jul. Anno. 2 Edw. 6.*

A Commission for the Restitution of the Temporalities of the said Bishoprick to the said *Robert Farrer*, as being void *per translationem Willelmi Barlow*. Dated *1 Augusti, Anno 2 Edw. 6.* In all which Records, and many more, he is always named as a true Consecrated Bishop.

And Lastly, In Bishop *Goodwin's* Book *de Præsulibus Angliæ*, pa. 663. of the Latin Edition, printed at *London*, Anno 1616. in his Catalogue of the Bishops of *St. Asaph* num. 37. he hath these words, *Gulielmus Barlow, Canonorum Regularium apud Bisham, Prior Consecratus est, Feb. 22. Anno 1535; Aprilis deinde sequente Meneviam translatus est; William Barlow, Prior of the Canons Regulars at Bisham, was Consecrated the two and twentieth Day of February, in the year 1535; and in April following was translated to St. Davids.* Which confirmeth me in my former Conjecture, that he was Consecrated in *Wales*, which Bishop *Goodwin*, by reason of his Vicinity, had much more reason to know exactly, than we have.

They say Mr. *Mason* acknowledgeth that Mr. *Barlow* was the Man who Consecrated *Parker*, because *Hodgkins*, the Suffragan of *Bedford*, was only an Assistant in that Action: and the Assistants, in the Protestant Church, do not Consecrate. By the Fathers leave, this is altogether untrue. Neither was Bishop *Barlow* the only Man who Consecrated Archbishop *Parker*; Neither was Bishop *Hodgkins* a meer Assistant in that Action. Thirdly, Whosoever

do impose Hands are joint Consecrators, with us as well as them. *Lastly*, Mr. Mason saith no such thing, as they affirm, but directly the Contrary, that all the four Bishops were equally Consecrators, all imposed Hands, all joined in the Words, and this he proveth out of the Register it self, L. 3. c. 9. n. 8. and l. 3. c. 10. n. 9.

They Object, *He might as well be proved to have been a lawful Husband, because he had a Woman, and divers Children; as to have been a Consecrated Bishop, because he Ordained, and Discharged all Acts belonging to the Order of a Bishop.* What was Bishop Barlow's Woman pertinent to this Cause. Are not Governants, and Devoteesses, besides ordinary Maid-servants, Women?

All which, Pastors, not only of their own Communion, but of their own Society, are permitted to have in their Houses. Let themselves be Judges, whether a Woman a Wife, or a Woman a Governant or a Devoteess, be more properly to be ranged under the Name or Notion of *συνεσκήνω*, such Women as were prohibited to cohabit with Clerks, by the Council of Nice. But to leave the *Hypothesis* and come to the *Thesis*, as being more pertinent to the present Case. If a Man have cohabited long with a Woman, as Man and Wife, in the General Estimation of the World, and begot Children upon her, and dies as her Husband, without any doubt or dispute during his Life, and long after; though all the Witnesses of their Marriage were dead, and the Register lost, this their Conjugal Cohabitation, and the common Reputation of the World, during his Life uncontroverted, is in Law a sufficient Proof of the Marriage: but all the World, *nemine contradicente*, esteemed Bishop Barlow as the undoubted Bishop and Spouse of his Church.

They add, Ridley, Hooper, Farrer, were acknowledged and obeyed as Bishops in King Edward's time, yet were fudged, by both the Spiritual and Temporal Courts, not to have been Consecrated. They mistake, they were not judged not to have been Consecrated, (for their Consecrations are upon Record,) but not to have been Consecrated

secrated *ritu Romano*, after the *Roman Form*. And who gave this Judgment? their open Enemies, who made no Scruple to take away their Lives, whose unjust Judgment we do not value a Rush: but *Paul* the 4. and *Cardinal Pole*, more authentick Judges, of their own Party, gave a later Judgment to the contrary.

They ask, *How it is possible that Barlow's Consecration should not be found Recorded (if ever it was,) as well as his Preferment to the Priory of Bisham, and Election and Confirmation to the Bishoprick of St. Asaph?* I answer it is very easy to conceive. I have shewed him sundry ways how it might be, and one probable way how it was. I desire the Reader to observe the extream Partiality of these Fathers, they make it impossible for the Acts of one Consecration to be lost or stolen, and yet accuse us of forging fifteen Consecrations. It is easier to steal fifteen, than to forge one Act.

We have often asked a Reason of them, why the *Protestants* should decline their own Consecrations? They give us one, *The Truth is, that Barlow, as most of the Clergy of England in those times, were Puritans, and inclined to Zuinglianism, therefore they contemned and rejected Consecration, as a Rag of Rome, and were contented with the extraordinary Calling of God and the Spirit, as all other Churches are, who pretend Reformation.* It is well they premised *the Truth is*, otherwise there had not been one word of *Truth* in what they say. *First*, How do they know this? It must be either by Relation, but I am confident they can name no Author for it: or by Revelation, but that they may not do: or it is (to speak sparingly) their own Imagination. It is a great Boldness, to take the liberty to cast aspersions upon the Clergy of a whole Nation. *Secondly*, How cometh Bishop *Barlow*, to be taxed of *Puritanism*? we meet him a Prior and a Bishop, we find him in his Robes, in his Rochet, in his Cope, Officiating, Ordaining, Confirming. He who made no scruple to Ordain and Consecrate others *gratis*, certainly did not forbear his own Consecration, with the apparent hazard of the Loss of his

his Bishoprick out of scruple of Conscience. *Thirdly*, this Asperion is not well accommodated to the Times ; For first *Zuinglianism* was but short-heeled in those Days when Bishop *Barlow* was Consecrated, who sat in Parliament as a Consecrated Bishop 31 *Hen.* 8. and the first Sermon that ever *Zuinglius* Preached, as a Probationer, was in *Zurick* in the year 1510, that was in the 10 or 11 year of *Henry the Eighth*. If there were any one *Zuinglian* in those days, upon their grounds, it is most likely to have been Bishop *Gardiner*, for his Consecration doth not appear, more than Bishop *Barlow's*.

But there is yet a greater Mistake in it ; it is the *Anabaptists* who reject Ordination, and content themselves with the extraordinary Calling of the Spirit, not the *Zuinglians*. In the Writings of *Zuinglius* we find a Letter of him and ten others of the principal *Helvetian* Theologians, to the Bishop of *Constance* ; beseeching him, in all humility and observance, to favour and help forward their Beginnings, as an excellent Work, and worthy of a Bishop ; They implore his Clemency, Wisdom, Learning, that he would be the First-fruits of the German Bishops ; They beseech him, by the Common Christ, by that Fatherly Affection which he owes unto them, to look graciously upon them, &c. They court him to shew himself a Father, and grant the Request of his obedient Sons. *Zuinglius* and the *Zuinglians* liked Bishops well enough, if they could have had them. But the Bishop of *Constance*, of another Communion, was their Bishop.

Here, Meander-like, they make a winding from *St. Asaph* back to *Cheapside*, from Bishop *Barlow's* Consecration to Archbishop *Parker's*. They say, that if there had been any other Consecration of Archbishop *Parker*, than that of the *Naggs-head*, John *Stow* would not conceal it in his *Annals* ; who is so diligent in setting down all that passed in and about *London*, and professeth personal Respect to him ; he having related the Consecration of Cardinal *Pole*, with so many particulars. They add, out of Dr. *Champney*, that John *Stow* acknowledged to many Persons that the Story of the *Naggs-head* was true. Their Store is very low, when they

they are forced to produce *John Stow*, who scarce knew what a Consecration was. But what saith he in his Chronicles? Not a word, either of the feign'd Consecration at the *Naggs-head*, or of the true Consecration at *Lambeth*. But he told it to many Persons by word of Mouth, that the Story of the *Naggs-head* was very true. If he did, he lied notoriously to many Persons, but we acquit him of that Calumny: let it rest upon them, who think it a meritorious Act, to advance Religion by any means, true or false; we are too well acquainted with their hear-say Reports. They who dare wrest his printed Works, ought not to be trusted with what he spake by word of Mouth, to some body, whom no body knows. Their Author saith to some Persons, they say to many Persons, thus this Snow-ball increaseth, *John Stow* is now dead, and dead Men do not bite; yet let us know to whom he said it? Doctor *Champney* tells us, they are timorous and would not be named. Good reason, for they have no Names: so *John Stow* is a silent Witness, and they are nameless Witnesses.

So much for the Man, now for the thing. I give three Answers; First, if *John Stow* were a Lover of the Truth, he should rather have set down the *Naggs-head* Ordination (if there was any such thing) than the *Lambeth* Ordination. Men would suppose the *Lambeth* Ordination of themselves, where nothing is said to the contrary, it is presumed for the Law; but the *Naggs-head* Consecration, had been such a Consecration, as never was before, nor never will follow after.

Secondly, Their Authors wrest *John Stow* abominably. He was no profest Writer of Ecclesiastical Annals. It is true, he mentioneth the Consecration of Cardinal *Pole*, whether it was his respect to his Eminence, as being a near Kinsman to the Queen, a Cardinal, the Pope's Legate, and his grand Minister for the Reconciliation of *England*, or because a toy took him in the Head; but not with so many particulars as the Fathers intimate; all he saith is this, the 21 of March, Dr. *Cranmer* Archbishop of *Canterbury* was burnt at *Oxford*, the
same

same day Cardinal Pole sang his first Mass at Greenwich in the Friars Church, on Sunday next he was Consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury (here was speedy Work,) and the 25 of March received the Pall, with the usual Ceremonies, at Bows Church in Cheapside. Here is another Naggs-head Meeting ; where he was Consecrated, by whom, and after what Form, he leaveth the Reader to presume; but of all other Consecrations performed in Queen Mary's time, this diligent Author mentioneth not so much as one ; of all the Consecrations in Queen Elizabeth's time, I think not one ; of all the Consecrations in England since the Conquest, not one, or so rarely, that they are not to be taken notice of. If the Argument of these Fathers were of any value, John Stow mentioneth not his Consecration at Lambeth, therefore he was not Consecrated there ; we never had a Consecration in England, since the Conquest, but Cardinal Pole's, for he mentioneth none but that, which I remember ; I am sure if he mention any, it is most rarely. If the Fathers Argument was good, Archbishop Parker was never Elected, nor Confirmed, because his Election and Confirmation are not Recorded by John Stow ; but all our Records, Civil as well as Ecclesiastical, do testify the Contrary.

*Lastly, If the Fathers would lay aside their Prejudice, there is enough in John Stow's Annals, to discover the the Falshood of the Lying Fable of the Consecration at the Naggs-head : By their Account, the Naggs-head Consecration was September 7. Anno 1559, but alter this, in relating the solemn Obsequies kept in St. Pauls Church for the French King, John Stow calleth him, Dr. Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury Elect, therefore the Naggs-head Consecration is a lying Fable ; if he was still Elect, he was not then Consecrated. But afterwards, speaking of his Death, May 17, 1575, which is the next time I find him mentioned, he stileth him the right Reverend Father in God, Matthew Parker, Dr. of Divinity, Archbishop of Canterbury. Here is no more the word Elect, for
atq.*

after Confirmation, and Consecration, the word Elect ceaseth, here he is complete *Archbishop* of Canterbury.

They say, *they who make no Conscience to falsify Scripture, will forge Records*: And how notoriously the English Clergy have falsified Scripture, is Demonstrated by Gregory Martin. I hope none of us did ever attempt to purge St. Paul's Epistles, because there were in them, *Quadam male sonantia*, Something that sounded not well, in the point of Justification. We desire good Words, until they be able to prove their Allegation. Rather than be accounted Falsifiers of the Scripture, we are contented to stand to the *Valgar Latin*, in any Controversy between them and us. But who is the Man doth accuse us of so many Falsifications? One Gregory Martin, one of their Fellows, whose Censure we do not weigh a Button. This is a new Inartificial kind of arguing, from the Authority of their own Writers.

But they use it much; so it followeth in the next Words, *It is want of Charity to think that Stapleton, Harding, Bristow and the rest of the English Catholick Doctors, who did forsake all at home for Conscience sake, would publish to the World in print, the Nullity of Parker's Ordination; thereby engaging Posterity to commit so many damnable Sacrileges, in re-ordaining those who had been validly Ordained already, without due Examination of the matter.* This Plea is much like that of the old Roman, that his Adversary did not receive the Wound with his whole Body, that he might have killed him fairly. They would have us rather put up with the Loss of our Holy Orders, than the Skill of their Doctors should be questioned. If Re-ordination be *damnable Sacrilege*, the Authority of your own Doctors may be a fit *medium* to convince your selves of Sacrilege, not us of the Invalidity of our Ordination. I hope Stephen the sixth, and Sergius the third, two Popes, were other manner of Men than your English Doctors, who did both pretend to examine the Matter as duly, and to be as averse from damnable Sacrilege as you, yet they decreed Publickly, and most unjustly, (as you your selves do now confess) that all the Holy Orders received from

Formosus

Formosus were void, and compelled all those who had been ordained by him, to be re-ordained. *Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. cap. 12.*

Mr. *Mason* cited the Testimony of a Witness beyond all exception, *Charles Howard* Earl of Nottingham, Lord High Admiral of England, who acknowledged Archbishop *Parker* to be his Kinsman, and that he was an invited Guest at his Consecration at *Lambeth*. To this the Fathers reply, *If this were true, it proves only that there was a good Dinner at Lambeth, which might well be to conceal the shameful Consecration at the Naggs-head.* It proves that there was a good Consecration, as well as a good Dinner; the Words are to honour his Consecration, and the Solemnity thereof, with his Presence. It had been something uncivil, to encumber the Tavern with a Consecration, and not stay Dinner there. The Earl was invited to the Consecration at *Lambeth*, therefore it was at *Lambeth*. The Earl was not at the *Naggs-head*; Mr. *Neal* himself, who saw more than ever was Acted, or so much as thought of, did not see that. Is it the Custom, when one is invited to a Consecration, to come, after it is done, to Dinner? or to invite a Nobleman to a Consecration in one place, and then be Consecrated in another? This had been so far from Concealing the Shamefulness of such a brainsick Consecration, that it had been a ready means to divulge it to all the World.

They add, *Besides, we must take the Earl's Friend's word for the Earl's Testimony, and Mr. Mason's word for his nameless Friend.* That is none of Mr. *Mason's* Fault, but Mr. *Hollywood's*, Mr. *Constable's*, Mr. *Sacrobosco's*, Dr. *Champney's*, Mr. *Fitz-Herbert's*, and Mr. *Fitz-Simon's*, who first broached this odious Fable. Mr. *Mason* published this Relation to the World in Print, while the Earl was yet living, on purpose that they might enquire and satisfy themselves; if they did not, they can blame no body but themselves; if they did, by themselves or their Friends, (as it is most likely they did) it is evident that the Answer did not content them, and so we never heard more of them since. It had been the greatest Folly in the World

World, to alledge the Testimony of such a Nobleman in his Life-time, contrary to his own knowledge, which might have been disproved from his own Authority, and so have easily laid Mr. *Mason* flat upon his back. You may remember your own case with the Bishop of *Durham*. But it was too true to be contradicted then, and too late to be contradicted now.

They say, *They bring more than one Witness of the Naggs-head Consecration*. Pardon me, You never produced one yet, and which is less than producing, you never so much as named a Witness, whilst he himself was living. In, or about, the year 1603, you first named Mr. *Neale*, and innocent *John Stow*, when they were both dead; you might as well have named the Man in the Moon as *John Stow*. Only I confess you named the Bishop of *Durham* in his Life-time, and you see what is the Issue of it: and if you had named the others in their Lifetimes, you must have expected a like Issue, either the perpetual Infamy of your Witness, or the utter Confusion of your Cause. You speak much of *the Learning, and Virtue, and Judgment* of your hear-say Witnesses, *who knew how to distinguish between an Episcopal Consecration, and a Banquet*. I hope you do not mean that the Earl of *Nottingham* did not know how to distinguish between a Banquet and a Consecration (if he did not, the High-Admiralship of *England* was ill committed to him) or that he had not as much regard to his Honour and Conscience, as any of your Priests. We meddle not with their Learning and Virtue, but we are no more obliged to take their Testimonies upon hear-say, than they would take our Testimonies. They have given an account to God, and know before this time whether they have done well or ill.

They proceed, *The Priests and Jesuits, to whom the Records were shewed in King James his time, protested against them, as forged and improbable, as appeareth by the Testimony of Men yet living, whose Honesty cannot be called in question. Father Faircloth, one of the Imprisoned Jesuits, testified so much to many by Word of Mouth and in Writing.*

Where

Where is the Writing ? where is the Protestation ? why are they not produced ? Still here is no Proof but upon Hear-say. One Eye-Witness is worth an hundred such, who can swear to no more but that they heard it, and God knows through how many Hucksters Hands. I hope the Bishop of *Durham's* Case will make them more wary for the future.

But they are angry with *some Protestants*, who endeavour to make this well grounded Story a *meer Fable*, and thereby call many Persons of much more Learning, Virtue, and Prudence than themselves, *Fools or Knaves*. We are plain *Macedonians*, who call a Fable a Fable, without either welt or guard ; yea, so notorious a Fable, that (but that you tell us the contrary) we could not believe that any one of you did ever give any Credit to it your selves ; any more than the *Athenians* did believe those monstrous Fables of Bulls and Minotaurs, which themselves had raised, because some of their eminent Citizens had devised it, or related it : But we call no Men *Fools or Knaves*. That Language is too unmannerly for Civil Writers. What new Topick is this, because we cannot believe a Man's Relation or his Judgment, do we straightway call him Fool or Knave ? Excuse me, there are Credulity, and Prejudice, and Mistakes, and pious Frauds in the World, and none of these will willingly wear the Livery of Knaves or Fools. We are not of the same Mind with Pope *Stephen* and Pope *Sergius*, for the re-ordaining of those, who had been ordained by *Formosus*, yet we do not call them *Knaves or Fools*. We cannot believe what you yourselves have related of my Lord of *Durham*, yet we are not guilty of such extravagant Expressions.

C H A P. X.

The Fathers insist too much upon the Authority of their own Party. Why Consecration is not mentioned at Restitution. The Exactness of our Records justified.

IT seemeth to me, that the Fathers insist too much upon the Honesty, and Virtue, and Learning of their own Party. In dispute with an Adversary, Virtue is like Fire, and preserveth it self by being covered with Ashes; but spread abroad by Ostentation, it is quickly extinguish'd; especially Comparisons are odious, and beget Altercation. We say, there is not a Hill so high in *Lincolnshire*, but there is another within a Mile as high as it; take you the Reputation of Learning and Prudence, so you leave us the better Cause; and we shall be able to defend it well enough against you. But the main Defect, in this part of your Discourse, is this, the Bishop of *Chalcedon* confesseth of Mr. *Oldcorn*, one of your Order, that he acknowledged these Records to be Authentick, and the rest of the Imprisoned Priests, who view'd the Records, are charged publickly in print to have done the same, by Bishop *Goodwin*, and by Mr. *Mason*; every thing ought to be unloosed the same way it is bound. They were all Scholars and could write, if this Charge were not true, they ought to have published a Protestation to the World in print to the contrary, whilst their Adversaries were living: but now after they, and their Adversaries, and the Witnesses are all so long dead, to talk of a verbal Protestation to some of their Friends, upon Hear-say, signifieth nothing.

Now we must make another Winding, and return to Bishop *Barlow*; but I hold to the Clue, in hopes at length to get out of this fictitious Labyrinth. Henry the 8th's Letters Patents, whereby Bishop *Barlow* was installed in (they would say restored to) the Temporalties of his Bi-

H

shoprick,

shoprick, make mention of his Acceptation and Confirmation, but none of his Consecration. Why should this last be omitted, if he were really Consecrated? This Objection sheweth nothing, but the Unskillfulness of the Fathers in our English Customs and Forms. Let them compare all the Restitutions of their Friends to their Temporalties in England, as Cardinal Pole's, Bishop Gardiner's, and the rest, and they shall find the Form the very same with Bishop Barlow's; I hope they will not conclude thence, that none of them were Consecrated. The Reason of the Form is very prudent. In a Restitution to Temporalties, they take no notice of any Acts that are purely Spiritual, as Consecration is; but only of such Acts as are Temporal, as Acceptation and Confirmation.

But if he was restored to his Temporalties, not being Consecrated, he might also sit in Parliament without Consecration. The Assumption is understood, But Bishop Barlow was restored to his Temporalties, without Consecration; which is most false. From the Conversion of the Nation unto this Day, they are not able to produce one Instance, of one Bishop, who was duly Elected, duly Confirmed, and duly restored to his Temporalties by the King's Mandate, without Consecration, or did sit in Parliament without Consecration. He must sit in Parliament in his Episcopal Habit, but that cannot be before Consecration. It seemeth they think that Bishops sit in Parliament, as Temporal Barons; but it is a great mistake, Bishops sat in the Great Councils of the Kingdom, before the Names of Parliament or Barons were heard of in England.

They bring an Argument from the Exactness of our Records, and that Connexion that is between Records of one Court and another. The first thing necessary to to obtain a Bishoprick in England, is the King's Condescendence; that appears in the Rolls. Next, the actual Election; that appears in the Records of the Dean and Chapter. Thirdly, the King's Acceptation of the Election, and his Commission to the Archbishop, or four Bishops, in the Vacancy, to Confirm the Election, and
Con-

Consecrate the Person Elected and Confirmed legally ; that appears in the *Letters Patents* enrolled. *Fourthly*, the Confirmation of the Election before the Dean of the *Arches*, but by the Archbishop's Appointment, this is performed always in *Bow Church*, (except extraordinarily it be perform'd elsewhere by Commission ;) this appears in the *Records* of the *Archbishop*. *Fifthly*, the Consecration it self, by the Archbishop and other Bishops, or other Bishops without him, by virtue of his Commission ; this appears in the *Records* of the *Prothonotary* of the See of *Canterbury*. *Lastly*, the Restitution of the Temporalities ; which appears in the *Rolls* ; and his Enthronization, in the *Records* of the *Dean* and *Chapter*. Every one of these takes another by the hand, and he who will enjoy a Bishoprick in *England*, must have them all. The Chapter cannot Elect without the King's *Condescendence*. The King never grants his *Letters Patents* for Confirmation and Consecration, until he have a Certificate of the Dean and Chapter's Election. The Dean of the *Arches* never Confirms, until he have the King's Commission. The Archbishop never Consecrates, until the Election be Confirmed. And *lastly*, the King never receiveth Homage for the Bishoprick, or giveth the Temporalities, nor do the Dean and Chapter enthrone, until after Consecration. He that hath any one of these Acts, must of Necessity have all that go before it in this Method : and he that hath the last, hath them all. But this was more than Mr. Neale, or whosoever was the Inventor of that silly Fable, did understand, otherwise he would have framed a more possible Relation.

Hence they argue, The Records being so exact, how is it possible that no Copies of Barlow's Consecration do appear in any Court or Bishoprick of England ? They mistake the matter wholly, the Consecration ought not to appear in any Court but one, that is, that Registry where he was Consecrated, which being not certainly known, at so great a distance of time, is not so easily found ; and I believe was never sought for yet further than *Lambeth*.

But all the other Acts do appear in their proper Courts; The King's Licence, the Dean and Chapter's Election, the King's Letters Patents, the Confirmation of the Dean of the Arches, which all go before Consecration; and his doing Homage, and the Restitution of him to his Temporalities, and his Enthronization, all which do follow the Consecration, and are infallible Proofs in the Law of Consecration; as likewise his sitting in Parliament, his Ordaining of Priests, his Consecrating of Bishops, his letting of Leases, his receiving of Hereditaments to him and his Successors, his exchanging of Lands, all which are as irrefragable Proofs of his Consecration, as any Man hath to prove that such Persons are his Parents, either Father or Mother. And when the right Register is sought, which must be by help of the Court of Faculties, I doubt not but his Consecration will be found in the proper place, as all the rest are.

Mr. *Mason* alleged, that Bishop *Gardiner's* Consecration was not to be found in the Register of *Lambeth*, any more than Bishop *Barlow's*; yet no Man doubted of his Ordination. They answer first, That Mr. *Mason* did not seek so solicitously or diligently for Bishop *Gardiner's* Consecration, as for Bishop *Barlow's*. Then why do not they, whom it doth concern, cause more diligent Search to be made? without finding the Records of Bishop *Gardiner's* Consecration, they cannot accuse Bishop *Barlow* of want of Consecration, upon that onely Reason. Secondly, they answer, That if *Gardiner's* Consecration was as doubtful as *Barlow's* and *Parker's*, they would take the same Advice they give us, to repair with speed to some other Church, of undoubted Clergy. Yes; where will they find a more undoubted Clergy? They may go further and fare worse. Rome it self hath not more exact Records, nor a more undoubted Succession, than the Church of England. There is no reason in the World to doubt either of Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration, or Bishop *Gardiner's*, or Bishop *Barlow's*. Neither doth his Consecration concern us so much, as the Fathers imagine; there

there were three Consecrators (which is the Canonical Number) besides him.

It is high time for the Fathers to wind up, and draw to a Conclusion of this Argument. That which followeth next is too high, and can scarcely be tolerated; to accuse the Publick Records and Archives of the Kingdom, and to insinuate the Primates and Metropolitans of England of Forgery, upon no ground but their own Imagination. I doubt whether they durst offer it to a Widow Woman. *As to the Impossibility of Forging so many Registers, in case there be so many, it is easily answer'd, That it is no more than that the Consecrators, and other Persons concerned, should have conspired to give in a false Certificate, that the Consecration was performed with all due Ceremonies and Rites, and thereby deceive the Courts, or make them dissemble.* Should any Man accuse the General of their Order, or one of their Provincials, or but the Rector of one of their Colleges, of Forgery and Counterfeiting the Publick Records of the Order; how would they storm, and thunder, and mingle Heaven and Earth together, and cry out, *No moderate or prudent Persons can suspect that such Persons should damn their Souls, that so many pious learned Divines should engage themselves and their Posterity, in damnable Sacrileges, without fear of Damnation.* If a Man will not believe every ridiculous Fable, which they tell by Word of Mouth, upon Hear-say, they call *Persons of more Virtue, Learning and Prudence than themselves, Fools and Knaves*: But they may insinuate the principal Fathers of our Church, of certifying most pernicious Lyes under their Hands and Seals, not for a piece of Bread, which is a poor Temptation, but for nothing, that is to make them both *Fools and Knaves*. Is not this blowing hot and cold with the same Breath? or to have the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ with respect of Persons? Compare the political Principles of the Church of England, with your own, and try if you can find any thing so destructive to Morality, to Truth, and Justice, and Conscience, as might lead us to perpetrate such

Crimes more than yourselves. We are not afraid of a Parallel. You profess great Endeavours to make Profelytes; we do not condemn Zeal, yet wish you had more Light with it: even in Prudence, which you your selves extol, this is not your right Course, to follow those Birds with noise and clamour, which you desire to catch.

In sum, your Answer or Solution is full of ignorant Mistakes. It confoundeth Civil Rolls and Ecclesiastical Registers. It supposeth that our Records are but Transcriptions, one out of another; whereas every Court Recordeth its own Acts, and keeps its self within its own Bounds. It taketh notice but of one Consecrator: whereas we have always three at the least, many times five or six. It quite forgetteth publick Notaries, which must be present at every Consecration with us, to draw up what is done into Acts; with us every one of these Notaries, when he is admitted to that Charge, doth take a solemn Oath upon his knees to discharge his Office faithfully, that is, not to make false Certificates. *Secondly*, It is absurd and unseasonable, to enquire how a thing came to pass that never was: you ought First to have proved, that our Records were forged, and then it had been more seasonable to have enquired modestly, how it came to pass. *Thirdly*, it is incredible, that Persons of such Prudence and Eminence, should make false Certificates under their Hands and Seals, to the utter Ruine of themselves and all that had a Hand it, and no Advantage to any Person breathing. It is incredible that those Records should be counterfeited in a corner, which were avowed publicly for Authentick by the whole Parliament of *England* in the 8 year of *Queen Elizabeth*; which were published to the World in Print, by the Person most concerned, as if he dared all the World to except against them: and yet no Man offered to except against them then. *Fourthly*, It is impossible to give in a false Certificate of a Consecration which was never performed in *England*, (especially at *Lambeth*) before less than thousands of Eye-witnesses: and that at *Lambeth*,
in

in the Face of the Court and *Westminster-Hall*. Surely they think we Consecrate in Closets, or Holes, or Hay-mows. They may even as well say that the Publick Acts of our Parliaments are counterfeited, and the Publick Acts of our Synods are counterfeited, and all our Publick Monuments counterfeited. It is none of the honestest Pleas, *Negare factum*, to deny such Publick Acts as these. *Fifthly*, This Answer is pernicious to Mankind, it is destructive to all Societies of Men, that Bishops, of so great Eminence, should conspire with Publick Notaries, to give in false Certificates, in a matter of such high Consequence as *Holy Orders* are, without any Temptation, without any hope of Advantage to themselves or others. It affordeth a large Seminary for Jealousies and Suspicions. It exterminateth all Credit and Confidence out of the World, and instructeth all Men to trust nothing, but what they see with their eyes. *Lastly*, It is Contradictory to themselves; they have told us, I know not how often, and tells us again in this Paragraph, That if the Naggs-head Consecration had been false, they might have convinced it by a thousand Witnesses. Here they make it an easy thing, for the Consecrators, and other Persons concerned, to conspire together to give in a false Certificate, that the Consecration was performed with all due Ceremonies and Rites; and thereby deceive the Courts, or make them dissemble. If the World will be deceived so, it is but right and reason that it be deceived; to be deceived by a false Certificate, that may be convinced by a thousand Witnesses, is Self-deceit.

But they say, *This is more possible and more probable, than that all the Clergy should conspire not to produce the same Registers, when they were so hardly pressed by their Adversaries.* These are but empty Pretences, there was no pressing to produce Registers, nor any thing objected, that did deserve the production of a Register. That which was objected against our Orders, in those days, was about the Form of Ordination published by *Edward the sixth*, and the Legality of our Ordination, in the time of *Queen*

Elizabeth ; the *Naggs-head* Consecration was never objected in those days. Besides, Registers are Publick enough themselves, and need no production ; and yet our Registers were produced, produced by the Parliament, 8 *Elizab.* who cited them as Authentick Records, produced and published to the World in Print, that was another Production.

They add, *Or that so many Catholicks should have been so foolish to invent or maintain the Story of the Naggs-head, in such a time, when, if it had been false, they might have been convinced by a thousand Witnesses.* Fear them not, they were wiser than to publish such a notorious Fable in those days ; they might perchance whisper it in Corners among themselves, but the boldest of them durst not maintain it, or object it in print, for fear of Shame and Disgrace. It was Folly to give an ear to it, but it was Knavery to invent it : and to do it after such a bungling manner, (whosoever was the Inventer) was Knavery and Folly complicated together.

If the Fathers write any more upon this Subject, I desire them to bring us no more *hear-say* Testimonies of their own Party ; whatsoever Esteem they may have themselves, of their Judgment, and Prudence, and Impartiality. It is not the manner of Polemick Writers to urge the Authority of their own Doctors to an Adversary ; or allege the modern Practice of their present Church. We have our own Church and our own Doctors, as well as they. If we would pin our Faith to the Sleeves of their Writers, and submit to their Judgments, and believe all their Reports, and let all things be as they would have it, we needed not to have any more Controversy with them : but we might well raise a worse Controversy in our selves, with our own Consciences.

C H A P. XI.

Of our Forms of Episcopal and Priestly Ordination; of Zuinglianifm: of Archbishop Laud; of Ceremonies. Our Assurance of our Orders.

WE have done with the Naggs-head for the present: That which followeth next doth better become Scholars, as having more shew of Truth and Reality in it. They object, that in all the Catholick Rituals, not only of the West but of the East, there is not one Form of Consecrating Bishops, that bath not the word Bishop in it, or some other Words expressing the particular Authority and Power of a Bishop distinctly. But in our Consecration, there is not one word to express the Difference and Power of Episcopacy. For these Words (*Receive the Holy Ghost*) are indifferent to Priesthood and Episcopacy, and used in both Ordinations. I answer, that the Form of Episcopal Ordination, used at the same time when Hands are imposed, is the same both in their Form and ours, (*Receive the Holy Ghost.*) And if these Words be considered singly, in a divided sense from the rest of the Office, there is nothing, either in our Form or theirs, which doth distinctly and reciprocally express Episcopal Power and Authority. But if these Words be consider'd conjointly, in a compound-ed sense, there is enough to express Episcopal Power and Authority distinctly, and as much in our Form as in theirs.

First, Two Bishops present the Bishop elect to the Archbishop of the Province, with these Words, *Most Reverend Father in Christ, we present to you this Godly and Learned Man to be Consecrated Bishop.* There is one Expression.

Secondly, Then the Archbishop causeth the King's Letters Patents to be produced and read, which require the Archbishop to Consecrate him a Bishop. There is a second Expression.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, The new Bishop takes his Oath of Canonical Obedience. *I A. B. elected Bishop of the Church and See of C. do profess and promise all Reverence and due Obedience to the Archbishop and Metropolitcal Church of D. and his Successors. So God help me, &c.* This is a third Expression.

Fourthly, Next the Archbishop exhorts the whole Assembly, to solemn Prayer for this Person thus elected and presented, before they admit him to that Office (that is the Office of a Bishop,) whereunto they hope he is called by the Holy Ghost, after the Example of Christ, before he did chuse his Apostles, and the Church of *Antioch*, before they laid Hands upon *Paul* and *Barnabas*. This is a fourth Expression.

Fifthly, Then followeth the *Litany*, wherein there is this express Petition for the Person to be ordained Bishop, *We beseech thee to give thy Blessing and Grace to this our Brother elected Bishop, that he may discharge that Office whereunto he is called, diligently, to the Edification of thy Church.* To which all the Congregation answer, *Hear us, O Lord, we beseech thee.* Here is a fifth Expression.

Sixthly, Then followeth this Prayer, wherewith the *Litany* is concluded, *Almighty God, the Giver of all good things, which by thy Holy Spirit hast constituted divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church; vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to look graciously upon this thy Servant, now called to the Office of a Bishop.* This is a sixth Expression.

Seventhly, Next the Archbishop telleth him he must examine him, before he admit him to that Administration whereunto he is called; and maketh a solemn Prayer for him, that God, who hath constituted some Prophets, some Apostles, &c. to the Edification of his Church, would grant to this his Servant, the Grace to use the Authority committed to him, to Edification not Destruction, to distribute Food in due season to the Family of Christ, as becometh a faithful and prudent Steward. This Authority, can be no other than Episcopal Authority, nor this Stewardship any other thing than Episcopacy. This is a seventh Expression.

Eighthly,

Eighthly, Then followeth Imposition of Hands, by the Archbishop and all the Bishops present, with these Words *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.* And *Lastly*, the Tradition of the Bible into his hands, exhorting him to *behave himself towards the Flock of Christ, as a Pastor, not devouring but feeding the Flock.* All this implieth Episcopal Authority. They may except against Christ's own Form of Ordaining his Apostles, if they will, and against the Form used by their own Church : but if they be sufficient Forms, our Form is sufficient. This was the same Form which was used in *Edward* the sixth's time, and we have seen how *Cardinal Pole* and *Paul* the fourth confirmed all, without Exception, that were ordained according to this Form ; so they would re-unite themselves to the *Roman Catholick Church.*

They bring the very same Objection against our Priestly Ordination, *The Form or Words, whereby Men are made Priests, must express Authority and Power to consecrate, or make present Christ's Body and Blood, (whether with or without Transubstantiation is not the present Controversy with Protestants.)* Thus far we accord, to the Truth of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood ; so they leave us this Latitude for the manner of his Presence. Abate us *Transubstantiation*, and those things which are Consequents of their determination of the Manner of Presence, and we have no Difference with them in this particular. They who are Ordained Priests, ought to have Power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, to make them present, after such manner as they were present at the first Institution ; whether it be done by Enunciation of the Words of Christ, as it is observed in the *Western Church* ; or by Prayer, as it is practised in the *Eastern Church* ; or whether these two be both the same thing in effect, that is, that the Forms of the Sacrament be mystical Prayers and implicate Invocations. Our Church, for more abundant Caution, useth both Forms, as well in the Consecration of the Sacrament, as in the Ordination of Priests. In the Holy Eucharist, our Consecration is a Repetition of that
which

which was done by Christ, and now done by him that Consecrateth in the Person of Christ; otherwise the Priest could not say *This is my Body*. And likewise in Episcopal Consecration, *Homo imponit manus, Deus largitur gratiam; Sacerdos imponit supplicem dexteram, Deus benedicit potente dextera: Man imposeth Hands, God conferreth Grace; The Bishop imposeth his suppliant right hand, God bleisseth with his Almighty right-hand*. In both Consecrations Christ himself is the chief Consecrator still; then if Power of Consecration, be nothing else but Power to do that which Christ did, and Ordained to be done, our Priests want not Power to Consecrate. They add, *In all Forms of Ordaining Priests, that ever were used in the Eastern or Western Church, is expressly set down the Word Priest, or some other Words expressing the proper Function and Authority of Priesthood, &c.* The Grecians using the word *Priest* or *Bishop*, in their Forms, do sufficiently express the respective Power of every Order. But our Reformers did not put into the Form of Ordaining Priests, any Words expressing Authority to make Christ's Body present. I answer, That if, by Forms of Ordaining Priests, they understand that essential Form of Words which is used at the same instant of time whilst Hands are imposed, I deny that in all Forms of Priestly Ordination the Word *Priest* is set down, either expressly or equivalently. It is set down expressly in the *Eastern Church*; it is not set down expressly in the *Western Church*. Both the *Eastern* and *Western* Forms are lawful, but the *Western* cometh nearer to the Institution of Christ.

But if, by Forms of Ordaining, they understand Ordinals or Rituals, or the entire Form of Ordaining; both our Church and their Church have not only equivalent Expressions of Priestly Power, but even the express Word *Priest* it self; which is sufficient both to direct and to express the Intention of the Consecrator. Under that Name the Archdeacon presenteth them, *Right Reverend Father in Christ, I present unto you these Persons here present, to be admitted to the Order of Priesthood*. Under that Name the Bishop admitteth them, *Well-be-*
loved

loved Brethren, these are they whom we purpose, by the Grace of God, this day to admit [co-optare] into the Holy Office of Priesthood. Under this Name the whole Assembly prays for them, Almighty God, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to look graciously upon these thy Servants, which this day are called to the Office of Priesthood. It were to be wished, that Writers of Controversies would make more use of their own Eyes, and trust less to other Mens Citations.

Secondly, I answer, That it is not necessary, that the essential Forms of Sacraments should be always so very express and determinate, that the Words are not capable of Extension to any other matter; if they be as determinate and express, as the Example and Prescription of Christ, it is sufficient. The Form of Baptism is, *I Baptize thee, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Not *I Baptize thee to Regeneration,* or for *Remission of Sins.* There are many other kinds of Baptisms or Washings, besides this Sacramental Baptism; yet this Form is as large as the Institution of Christ. And these general Words are efficacious, both to Regeneration and Remission of Sins, as well as if Regeneration and Remission of Sins had been expressly mentioned. In this Form of Baptism, there is enough antecedent, to direct and regulate both the Actions and Intentions of the Minister: So there is likewise in our Form of Ordination.

Thirdly, I answer, That in our very Essential Form of Priestly Ordination, Priestly Power and Authority is sufficiently expressed; we need not seek for a needle in a bottle of Hay. The Words of our Ordinal are clear enough. First, *Receive the Holy Ghost,* (that is, the Grace of the Holy Ghost) *to exercise and Discharge the Office of Priesthood, to which thou hast been now presented, to which thou hast been now accepted, and for which we have pray'd to God, that in it thou may'st discharge thy Duty faithfully and acceptably.*

Secondly, In these Words, *whose Sins thou dost remit, they are remitted,* that is, not only by Priestly Absolution; but by Preaching, by Baptizing, by Admini-
strating

string the Holy Eucharist, which is a means to apply the all-sufficient Sacrifice of Christ, for the Remission of Sins. He who authorizeth a Man to accomplish a Work, doth authorize him to use all means which tend to the Accomplishment thereof.

That which is objected, That *Lay-men have Power to remit Sins by Baptism, but no Power to Consecrate*, signifieth nothing, as to this point. For *first*, their own Doctors do acknowledge, that a *Lay-man cannot Baptize solemnly, not in the Presence of a Priest, or a Dean, nor in their Absence, except only in case of Necessity.* Saint Austin gives the Reason, because *no Man may invade another Man's Office.* Lay-men may, and are bound to instruct others, in case of Necessity: yet the Office of Preaching and Instructing others, is Conferred by Ordination. The ordinary Office of Remitting Sins, both by Baptism and by the Holy Eucharist, doth belong to Bishops, and under them to Priests.

Thirdly, This Priestly Power to Consecrate, is contained in these Words, *Be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and Sacraments.* And afterwards, when the Bishop delivers the holy Bible into the Hands of those who are ordained Priests, *Have thou Authority to preach the Word of God, and Administer the Sacraments.* We do not deny, but Deacons have been admitted to distribute and minister the Sacraments, by the Command or Permission of Priests, or as Subservient unto them: but there is as much difference between a subservient Distribution of the Sacrament, and the *Dispensing* or *Administering* of it, as there is between the Office of a Porter, who distributeth the Alms at the Gate, and the Office of the Steward, who is the proper Dispenser of it. Look to it, Gentlemen; If your own Ordination be valid, ours is valid, and more pure.

They make the Cause of these Defects in our Form of Ordination, to be, *because Zuinglianism and Puritanism did prevail in the English Church in those Days.* They believing not the Real Presence; therefore they put no Word in their Form, expressing Power to Consecrate. They held Epis-

copacy

episcopacy and Priesthood to be one and the same thing ; Therefore they put not in one Word expressing the Episcopal Function. This is called leaping over the Stile, before a Man comes at it ; to devise Reasons of that which never was. First, prove our Defects, if you can ; and then find out as many Reasons of them as you list. But, to say the Truth, the Cause and the Effect are well coupled together. The Cause, that is, the Zuinglianism of our Predecessors, never had any real Existence in the nature of things, but only in these Mens Imaginations : So the Defects of our Ordinals are not real but imaginary. Herein the Fathers adventur'd too far, to tell us that we have nothing in our Forms of Ordaining, to express either the Priestly or Episcopal Function ; when the very Child, that is able to read, can tell them, that we have the express Words of Bishops and Priests in our Forms, over and over again ; and maintain to all the World, that the three Orders, of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, have been ever, from the Beginning, in the Church of Christ.

In prefatione.

This, they say, is the true Reason, why Parker and his Collegues were contented with the Naggs-head Consecration, (that is to say, one brainfick Whimsy is the Reason of another :) and why others recurred to extraordinary Vocation in Queen Elizabeth's time. Say what others ? name one genuine Son of the Church of England, if you can ? Doctor Whitaker, and Doctor Fulke, who are the only two Men mentioned by you, are both professedly against you. Doctor Whitaker saith, We do not condemn all the Order of Bishops, as he falsely slanders us, but only the false Bishops of the Church of Rome. And Doctor Fulke, For Order and seemly Government among the Clergy, there was always one Principal, to whom the Name of Bishop or Superintendant hath been applied, which room Titus excercised in Crete, Timothy in Ephesus, others in other Places. Adding, that the Ordination, or Consecration, by Imposition of Hands, was always principally committed to him.

De Eccles.

*cont. 2. q. 5.
c. 3.*

In Titum c. 1.

The

The Fathers proceed, *If Mr. Laud had found Success in his first Attempt, it is very credible, he would, in time, have reformed the Form of the English Ordination.* That pious and learned Prelate wanted not other Degrees in Church and Schools, which they omit. He was a great Lover of Peace, but too judicious to dance after their Pipe; too much versed in Antiquity to omit their Matter and Form, or to attempt to correct the *Magnificat*, for Satisfaction of their humours. But whence had they this credible Relation? We are very confident, they have neither Author nor Ground for it, but their own Imagination. And if it be so, what Excuse they have for it, in their Case-Divinity, they know best: but in ours, we could not excuse it from down-right Calumny.

They have such an Eye at our Order and Uniformity, that they cannot let our *long Cloaks and Surplices* alone. We never had any such Animosities among us about our Cloaks, as some of their Religious Orders have had about their Gowns: both for the Colour of them, whether they should be black, or white, or gray, or the natural Colour of the Sheep; And for the Fashion of them, whether they should be long or short, &c. in so much as two Popes successively could not determine it.

If Mr. *Mason* did commend the Wisdom of the *English Church*, for paring away superfluous Ceremonies in Ordination, he did well. Ceremonies are Advancements of Order, Decency, Modesty, and Gravity in the Service of God, Expressions of those heavenly Desires and Dispositions, which we ought to bring along with us to God's House, Adjuments of Attention and Devotion; Furtherances of Edification, visible Instructors, Helps of Memory, Exercises of Faith, the Shell that preserves the Kernel of Religion from Contempt, the Leaves that defend the Blossoms and the Fruit; but if they grow over thick and rank, they hinder the Fruit from coming to Maturity, and then the Gardener plucks them off. There is great difference between the hearty Ex-
pressions

pressions of a faithful Friend, and the mimical Gesture of a fawning Flatterer : between the unaffected Comeliness of a grave Matron, and the Fantastical Paintings, and Patchings, and Powdrings of a garish Courtesan.

When Ceremonies become burthensom, by excessive Superfluity, or unlawful Ceremonies are obtruded, or the Substance of Divine Worship is placed in Circumstances, or the Service of God is more respected for Human Ornaments, than for the Divine Ordinance; it is high time to pare away Excesses, and reduce things to the ancient Mean.

These Fathers are quite out, where they make it lawful at sometimes to add, but never to pare away : yet we have pared away nothing, which is either prescribed or practised by the *true* Catholick Church. If our Ancestors have pared away any such things, out of any mistake (which we do not believe,) let it be made appear evidently to us, and we are more ready to welcome it in again at the fore-door, than our Ancestors were to cast it out at the back-door. *Errare possumus, hæretici esse nolumus.*

To conclude, as an impetuous Wind doth not blow down those Trees which are well radicated, but causeth them to spread their Roots more firmly in the Earth : so these Concussions of our Adversaries, do confirm us in the undoubted Assurance of the Truth, and Validity, and Legality of our holy Orders. We have no more reason to doubt of the Truth of our Orders, because of the different Judgment of an handful of our partial Countrymen, and some few foreign Doctors, misinformed by them : than they themselves have to doubt of the Truth of their Orders, who were ordained by *Formosus*, because two Popes, *Stephen* and *Sergius*, one after another, out of Passion and Prejudice, declared them to be void and invalid.

But supposing, that which we can never grant without betraying both our selves and the Truth, that there were some remote Probabilities, that might occasion suspicion in some Persons, prepossessed with Prejudice,

of the Legality of our Orders: yet for any Man, upon such pretended Uncertainties, to leave the Communion of that Church, wherein he was baptized, which gave him his Christian Being, and to apostate to them, where he shall meet with much greater grounds of Fear, both of Schism and Idolatry; were to plunge himself in a certain Crime, for fear of an uncertain Danger.

Here the Fathers make a brief Repetition of whatsoever they have said before in this Discourse, (either out of Distrust of the Reader's Memory, or Confidence of their own Achievements,) of the *Naggs-head*, and Mr. *Neal*, and the Protestant Writers, and Bishop *Bancroft*, and Bishop *Morton*, and the other Bishops, that sat with him the last Parliament, (which being the only thing alledged by them in the Author's Life-time and proved so undeniably to be false, is enough to condemn all the rest of their *Hear-say* Reports, for groundless Fables) of our Registers, of King *Edward's* Bishops, of Bishop *Barlow*, and of the Form of our Ordination; Directing him, who will clear all those Doubts, what he hath to do, as if we were their Journeymen. Let them not trouble themselves about that, they are cleared to the least grain.

But if they will receive Advice for Advice, and pursue a prudential Course, which they prescribe to others; if they regard the present Face of the Skie, and look well to their own Interest, and the present Conjunction of their Affairs: they have more need, and are more ingaged in Reputation, to defend themselves, than to oppugn others.

So they conclude their Discourse with this short Corollary, *How unfortunately was Charles the first, late King of England, misinformed in matter of his Bishops and Clergy? what Scruple could he have had, if he had known the Truth, to give way to the Parliament, to pull down Parliament-Bishops, who were so far from being de jure divino, that they were not so much as de jure Ecclesiastico?* We thank you, Gentlemen, for your good will. The Orthodox Cler-

gy of *England* are your Fear; and you know what commonly followeth after Fear, Hate, *Oderunt quos metuunt.* What pity it is that you were not of King *Charles* his Council, to have advised him better? yet we observe few Princes thrive worse, than where you pretend to be great Ministers. If you had counsell'd him upon this Subject, perhaps you might have found him too hard for you; as another did, whose Heart he burst with down-right Reason. If ever that Innocent King had a finger in the Blood of any of that Party, that was it, to choak a Man with reason: but certainly that wise Prince would not have much regarded your positive Conclusions, upon hear-say Premisses.

We hold our Benefices by Human Right, our Offices of Priests and Bishops both by Divine Right and Human Right. But put the case we did hold our Bishopricks only by Human Right; Is it one of your Cases of Conscience; that a Sovereign Prince may justly take away from his Subjects any thing which they hold by Human Right? If one Man take from another that which he holds justly by the Law of Man, he is a Thief and a Robber by the Law of God. Let us alter the Case a little, from our Bishopricks, to their Colleges, or their Treasures: If any Man should attempt to take them from them, upon this ground, because they held them but by Human Right, they would quickly cry out with *Ploiden*, *the Case is altered.* Be our Right Divine or Human, or both, if we be not able to defend it, against any thing the Fathers can bring against it, we deserve to lose it.



F I N I S.

y of E... and you know what com-
 m... follow... I say that, O...
 W... it is that you... of...
 O... have... in... we observe...
 P... that... you... to be great
 M... called...
 P... have...
 H... he... of...
 O... King... the...
 of... to... with...
 c... will...
 your... Conclusion...
 We hold our... Human Rights...
 of... and... by... and Hu-
 man Rights... we hold our...
 rights only by Human Rights; it is...
 of... that a... take
 away from the... which...
 Human Rights? I... take...
 which he holds... the Law of Man, he is a
 Thief and Robber by the Law of God. Let us ask
 the... to their Colle-
 ges or their... Man should attempt to
 to take them from them upon this ground, because
 they held them out by Human Rights, they would
 quickly say, we will... Be our
 Right... or... we be not able to
 defend it against any thing the... can bring a-
 gainst it, we deserve to lose it.

66 YF 62



26

U T N I S

